

THE MONTH

A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 551 (NEW SERIES 161) MAY, 1910

CONTENTS

AN UNOBSERVED CENTENARY. I.....	<i>By the Rev. J. H. Pollen</i>	449
"LA TERREUR BLANCHE".....	<i>By the Editor</i>	462
LORD KELVIN. 1826—1907.....	<i>By Bernard J. Whiteside</i>	468
THE JUBILEE OF THE CATHOLIC NEEDLEWORK GUILD.	<i>By John W. Gilbert</i>	481
THE SCOTTISH GAELS AND THE "REFORMATION." II.	<i>By the Hon. R. Erskine</i>	487
STUDY OF A RUSSIAN CATHEDRAL.....	<i>By T. Percy Armstrong</i>	495
THE COMING ELECTIONS IN BELGIUM.....	<i>By J. Wilfrid Parsons</i>	503
"PASCUA, RURA, DUCES".....	<i>By T. H. Pritchard</i>	515
FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.....		520
Royal and Noble Jesuits. "Ido," a New International Language. "Catholic Socialism." Haeckelian Philosophy. How Convent-Scandals are Manufactured. Natural Theology and an Oxford Professor.		
REVIEWS		532
SHORT NOTICES		551
BOOKS RECEIVED		557
SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS		560

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

[Editorial Offices, 31 Farm Street, Berkeley Square, W.]

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

PSYCHOLOGY:

Empirical and Rational.

BY

MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.LIT.; M.A. LOND.

SIXTH EDITION.

(SEVENTEENTH TO NINETEENTH THOUSAND.)

PRICE 6s. 6d.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Fourth Edition. Price 5s.
3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. (Tenth to Twelfth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.





An Unobserved Centenary.

I.

WITH the year 1903 there passed unnoticed a centenary, in itself well worthy of attention. It was the hundredth year of the restoration of the Society of Jesus in England, a century which has been prolific in men of worth and note, and in works that have proved lasting, honourable, and beneficent. During that period the religious body in question has grown from something under a score to nearly 800 members, who are doing the work of missionaries under every sky, and have in their own land founded numerous churches, colleges, and schools, all full of life and vigour, many of which have celebrated their jubilees with some pomp and circumstance, while the mother institute has passed her centenary in silence.

Yet that silence to some extent became the occasion. The restoration of 1803 was of the most quiet conceivable kind, which had perforce to be kept in profound secrecy, and was not only deprived of the formalities usual on such an occasion, but it was actually without any open sanction even of Canon Law. It was a matter of conscience, approved and repeatedly encouraged by the Supreme Pontiff *pro foro interno* only, as will be explained below, but incapable of being sustained *in foro externo*.

On the other hand, in the year 1814 the Society was restored publicly throughout the world by the Bull *Sollicitudo omnium Ecclesiarum*, and this is naturally a far better landmark in itself, and a notable point in the development of the Society. The year 1914, then, if the fates are propitious, may give us a suitable occasion for reviewing the work done in the past hundred years.

In that century, however, there will be reverses to chronicle as well as successes, and the date 1814 does not recall the memory of a brilliant start. Owing to the circumstances of pre-emancipation England, the Jesuits were still constrained to shroud their institute in absolute privacy, and to forego all the

privileges and securities, which in Canon Law are considered essential to the well-being of Religious Orders. There was, in fact, an influential party among the English Catholics of that day, comprising, it must be regretfully owned, the majority of the English Vicars Apostolic, who feared that the recognition of the Jesuits in England would hazard the fortunes of the whole Catholic body, and who therefore resolutely set their faces against acknowledging their existence.

This long and dispiriting delay, which of course told very heavily on the energy and enterprize of the Order as well as on vocations to its ranks, was only terminated on the first day of the year 1829, when Pope Leo XII. wrote with his own hand and signed the decree that the English Jesuits were henceforward entitled to the recognition and to all the rights canonical and spiritual enjoyed by the other Religious Orders in England. It was not a re-establishment of the Society in England, but an acknowledgment that the public restoration of 1814 held good in this country.

The reasonableness of postponing the centenary of the restitution of the Society in England in 1803 will therefore need no further demonstration, and it seems best even now to confine ourselves to one aspect of the subject, the curious and prolonged delay which attended the recognition. What has been done since the recognition is in one sense obvious to the attentive observer, whereas the protracted negotiations that preceded are hard to trace, and have never yet been adequately described in print. Nor will it be possible, even now, to do this completely, for the records of the Congregation of Propaganda, in which the main part of the negotiations took place, are not yet available for general study. Some recent publications, however, have greatly facilitated the presentment of our story. First there are two English Catholic Histories by the President and Vice-President of St. Edmund's.¹ Though they do not bring their story down far enough to cover the whole field which we have to review, they tell us a good deal about certain episodes, and indirectly assist us all through, by setting forth the peculiar character and temper of the times with a thoroughness never attempted before. For not until one appreciates the retiring, patient, waiting spirit of pre-emanci-

¹ *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England, 1781—1803.* By Mgr. Canon Bernard Ward; *The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner, 1691—1781.* By Edwin H. Burton, D.D.

pation Catholics, is one in a position to pass on to the further question, whether and for how long the Jesuits should, *pro bono publico*, have been kept confined in the catacombs.

Of greater service still for our purposes is the last published volume of Father Hughes's *History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, which contains quite a number of documents relating to the English Jesuits during our period, documents which, if important for America as precedents, are doubly valuable for us. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity of dealing here with all three histories more fully than space permitted in the book reviews which appeared as the volumes were published.¹

The sons of the Society in England probably suffered less under the Suppression (July 21, 1773) than did the Jesuits of any other country in Europe. In England the Society had always been remarkably popular, and the proportion of the Jesuits in the total number of the clergy had always been unusually high. Again, the agitation against the Order, which was engineered by the Bourbon Courts, and finally led to the Suppression, found very little echo in this country. Upon the clergy living abroad, however, and especially on the younger men who were then being educated in the bitterly anti-Jesuit atmosphere of France and Rome, a sinister impression was inevitably left. The well-known testimony of Cardinal Pacca on the manner in which hostility to the Society was then deliberately fostered in youthful minds may be quoted again here. Of Pope Pius and of himself, Pacca says:

The Pope had had anti-Jesuit masters and teachers, who had inculcated maxims and opinions altogether opposed to those of the Society: and everyone knows how deep are the impressions made by early teaching. I, too, had been taught in my youth to nourish against the Order feelings of aversion and hatred which amounted even to fanaticism. Suffice it to say that I was given Pascal's famous *Provincial Letters* (with the notes of Nicole under the name of Wendrock, both in French and Latin), to analyse and take notes from; I had also been

¹ Besides the above I have made much use of Father Thomas Glover's *Restoration of the English Province*, the full title of which is, *A collection of notes, memoirs, and documents respecting the re-establishment of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*. The autograph of this (276 pp. folio) is preserved at Stonyhurst. More important still are three volumes in the Archives of the English Province S.J. containing letters from the Father Generals and from Fathers Stone and Strickland respectively. They will be quoted as *E. P. A., Epp. Gen., Stone Letters, &c.* I must also thank Père François Gaillard, who is writing a History of the Society at this period, for showing me various important papers found by him at the Vatican.

given Arnauld's *Morale Pratique du Jésuite*, and other books of a similar kind. I was in perfect good faith about these books, and had not a shadow of a doubt as to their truth and accuracy.¹

In the later periods of our story, we shall be dealing with men educated under the influences here indicated, but grown up and come into power, and we shall notice at once the effect of the hostile influences here described. In 1773, however, they were practically not felt at all, and by a special dispensation of Providence for the English Jesuits, Bishop Challoner was then in power at London. He was, indeed, obliged to exact from every Father in the district an act of submission to the Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor*, and one of these acts of submission, signed by the then Provincial, Father Henry More, and twenty-five of his subjects, is still in the Westminster Archives.² But whenever he could act freely, Challoner's consideration for the *Padri* in their desolation stands out in agreeable contrast to that of the Catholics in other countries, including Rome. According to the instructions issued with the "Destructive Brief," every Jesuit was to be severed from his previous work and surroundings, and to be kept under something hardly distinguishable from arrest until his future status was decided. These instructions were carried out to the letter in most countries. Even at Bruges the English Jesuits were turned by force out of their homes, and several, including Father Charles Plowden, were kept in confinement for many months. Dr. Challoner treated the Fathers not only with perfect courtesy, but with a liberality which is all the more remarkable when we remember the contrary instructions received from headquarters. He was fortunately able to plead that the literal execution of the Roman decrees was impossible in his circumstances, and might easily bring him within the danger of the penal laws. He therefore eventually took the course of leaving men, money, and goods as far as possible just as they had been before. He even appointed Father More "my vicar over his quondam brethren in my district, as I take him to be a very worthy man, and believe this will be the best means to cement us together."³ As regards temporals he wrote to Stonor, his agent with the Propaganda in Rome :

¹ Pacca, *Mémoires*, 1832, ii. 182, 183.

² Hughes, *Documents*, I, ii. 607.

³ Burton, *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, ii. 168.

As to your second question, I agree with you that it would be best to employ their goods and effects in the same way as before, at least as far as that can be done in their present state: for this is certain that our mission cannot be sufficiently furnished with workers without their aid. . . Unless the houses of Bruges and Liège can be changed into establishments for the education of English secular clergy, we shall never be able to furnish this country and America with sufficient workers.¹

In the *Memorial on the English Jesuits* presented to Mgr., afterwards Cardinal Borgia, by Challoner's agent in Rome, we find the suggestion of allowing the ex-Jesuits to form themselves into a Congregation of secular priests, with or without simple vows, and that they should be formally entrusted with the continuation of the good works they had been engaged upon before.² Considering the animosity against the Society still rife in Rome, there can be no wonder at this *Memorial* remaining without eventual success. That it should even have been proposed at all must be considered an act of unusual broad-mindedness and independence for those days.

The second providential patron of the English Jesuits in their day of trial was Francis Charles Count Welbruck, Prince-Bishop of Liège, who, in the course of a few months after the Suppression, allowed the Fathers of the College there, which had been instituted, and till then reserved for Jesuit Scholastics, to keep up their courses for the young divines, and also to admit lay scholars. Now that we know how decidedly Challoner desired this result, we cannot doubt that his good offices would have been invoked to bring it about, and that they powerfully contributed to its consummation.

Thus the English ex-Jesuits, not long after the destruction of their Order, found themselves incorporated again in a kind of informal confraternity, recalling in some sort their ancient Institute. The Brief of Suppression had not cancelled the vows already taken, and appointed no new Superiors to take the place of the old. The old ones therefore continued, with the sanction, as we see, of the Vicars Apostolic, to discharge

¹ See Hughes, pp. 602—608, Letters of the Prefect of Propaganda, August 25, 1773, to Dr. Challoner, and Challoner's answers, September 10, 17, and 24, 1773, announcing the acceptance of the Suppression by the Jesuits, and giving a short account of their property, which is much diminished, "that which remains is reducible to the savings from the pensions which several of their members have reserved from their patrimonies."

² Burton, *Life of Challoner*, ii. 169, 170.

some of their previous duties. After the last Provincial, Father More, had become incapacitated by age and infirmity,¹ Father William Strickland, Procurator in London, was generally regarded as their head, until the President of Stonyhurst was appointed Provincial. The funds, such as they were, remained in the same hands, and were applied to the same uses. Even the Provincial Congregations were represented by Congresses, which, however, did not meet very regularly. Recruits joined the body, chiefly from the college of Liège, and they were admitted after due probation not to vows, but to a special form of mission-oath. By this they promised first to serve the college for eight years after ordination, if called upon to do so, and secondly to go afterwards to the English Mission, and to live there in subordination to the Vicars Apostolic in that country. The first promise enabled the ex-Jesuits to maintain the college staff, the second promise made it possible to continue the supply of pastors for most of the chapels and missions they had previously founded or served in England.

The cohesive forces, which kept the ranks together, were of many sorts. First came the love of the ex-Jesuits for the old Order and its traditions. Next we may well place the goodwill, and even initiative, of Bishops Challoner, Hornyhold, and other Vicars of that time. The laity of that day, too, exercised an influence in favour of the Jesuits much more deep and effectual than we might have guessed from the altered positions of our own days. The Catholic congregations in England then depended to a quite abnormal extent on the Catholic gentlemen or nobles who erected the churches and subsidized the chaplains. Now, the friends and patrons of the Jesuits were exceedingly numerous in the educated class. Where a Catholic Squire had in old times been used to a Jesuit chaplain, he would, as a rule, require an ex-Jesuit now, and his demands were fairly sure to be attended to. In towns where chapels had been erected by Jesuit money, the ex-Jesuit body came, at all events later, to be regarded as a sort of patron of the living, and presented their *alumni* to it.

The great difficulty of the fraternity was the want of canonical sanction. Indeed, the instructions which had accompanied the Brief of Suppression, and which forbade any kind

¹ He died at Bristol in 1795, the last descendant in the male line from Blessed Thomas, the martyred Chancellor.

of association, were still unrecalled. Though they were not likely to be executed now, the first duty of the friends of the Seminary was to procure some document from Rome which should guard against attack from that quarter. Petitions were accordingly made to the Pope, and on September 15, 1778, he issued the Brief, *Catholici Praesules*, probably the first Brief issued in favour of the quondam Jesuits. It is directed to Bishop Welbruck, and is primarily concerned in justifying his action, and absolving him from all censure, supposing any had been incurred. It did not quite give any specific privileges to the Seminary, but sanctioned all the Bishop had done, and praised the new undertaking in noteworthy words as, *Novum Instituti genus, quod veluti quaedam propago primaevae missionis cum eodemmet priori fructu in exequendis illius muneribus versatur*—"An institute of a new kind, an offshoot, as it were, from the ancient mission, and occupied in carrying out its functions, with the very same success as before." This was certainly a good beginning. There was now no more doubt that the new institution had the blessing and good wishes of the Church. A friendly patron like Bishop Welbruck might, on the strength of this, allow them all the privileges convenient to their state.

It has been suggested above that the Jesuits at the Suppression were probably better treated in England than in any other country. Yet there was one country in Europe where the Jesuits were happy enough to escape the Suppression altogether. The Empress Catherine prevented the execution of the "Destructive Brief" by the use of her absolute power, just as the Bourbons had by force wrung that Brief from the unwilling Pontiff. Had Pius VI., who soon succeeded Clement XIV., felt himself secure against hostile attacks, he would soon have approved of Catherine's action. As it was, several years passed before Catherine's agent, Benislawski, could approach the Holy See and apply for an approbation of his mistress's action on behalf of the Society. Even then Pius, considering the still active hostility of Spain, and the threatening attitude of Joseph II., thought it imprudent to do more than give a *viva voce* approval of what had been done, with an instruction for the future, dated August 30, 1782.

News of this was soon sent to Liège, and Father John Howard, the President, immediately wrote a letter, of which a copy is still extant, congratulating Father Czerniewicz with the greatest warmth on the preservation of the Society, and

begging him to aggregate at once the English ex-Jesuits to his subjects. Czerniewicz, in reply (October, 1783), described the *viva voce* approbation already given, and begged the English Fathers to assist by their prayers and good works in the further reconstruction of their ancient Institute; but he declared it impossible as things then stood to aggregate others to his Province who did not actually reside in it, though that favour might be obtained later.

The next event to be mentioned, though it does not touch us closely, is the decree of Propaganda dated July 15, 1786, and communicated in a friendly letter to Father William Strickland, Procurator of the ex-Jesuits, on January 22nd following, by Bishop Thomas Talbot. The decree and correspondence are printed in full by Father Hughes.¹ They do not immediately concern us here, for they relate to the Jesuit temporalities, about which it will not be necessary for us to treat in our present quest. For, though the subject of temporals was no doubt important, and frequently in the minds of all, yet it never became a matter of actual debate in England, as it did in America and elsewhere. It was not mentioned again in the series of Pontifical and episcopal documents, to which we have chiefly to attend.

There will again be no need to enter here into a detailed account of the remarkable² history of the migration of the Seminary from Liège to Stonyhurst (August 27, 1794). The arrival of the ex-Jesuit College in England did them no doubt much good, but at first several inconveniences were felt, some of them acutely from time to time. Thus, whereas they had before been inconspicuous and unnoticed, their return to England made it clear, perhaps for the first time, that they were a body destined to live, perhaps even to surpass, any educational establishment in the country. Hence gradually arose an element of competition with other institutions already in England, and a consequent watchfulness on the part of those whose interests were bound up with them.³ Dr. William

¹ Hughes, *Documents* I. ii. 644—656. The decree dealt with "reports" that the ex-Jesuits were disposing of the old Jesuit temporalities as though they were private property. The "reports" were demonstrably false, no proof of them was attempted, and they died a natural death.

² The present writer cannot but regret that we have not a special study of the three migrations, first from St. Omers to Bruges, then on to Liège, then to Stonyhurst. Taken together these journeys form a unique page in the annals of school history, honourable in the highest possible degree both to staff and scholars.

³ B. Ward, *Dawn of the Catholic Revival*, p. 106.

Gibson, however, the Vicar of the Northern District in which Stonyhurst was situated, received them kindly indeed, but made the offer that the new arrivals should join forces for good and all with the clergy of the district, and "forget all past distinctions between Douay and Liège." However well-meant this proposal was, no one in touch with the aspirations of the Stonyhurst community could have failed to see that such a proposal would strike a jarring note in an address of welcome.¹ The Bishop also seems to have asserted rights over the election of the President, which caused considerable anxiety.² The ex-Jesuits therefore were much relieved when they obtained from Propaganda, February 14, 1796, a confirmation of their Brief, *Catholici Praesules*.

This rescript went further than the Brief it nominally confirmed. The main object of the former was to protect the Bishop of Liège against possible objections drawn from the Brief of Suppression, and left the college entirely under his control. In this rescript the Pope took the college under his own protection, and confirmed all previous privileges, and declared that the *alumni* have all the privileges enjoyed by any Pontifical or episcopal seminary. There was again no systematic enumeration of those privileges, but the general terms were sufficient to justify a friendly Bishop in allowing the President certain useful faculties, as, for instance, to grant when necessary dimissorials for the ordination of his respective subjects. Bishops Walmesley, Sharrock, and Milner did this; but the majority of the Vicars refused to do so.

After the issue of this second rescript there was little chance of Pope Pius VI. doing more to help the English ex-Jesuits. The tide of revolution, with some brief ebbings, was now surging into Italy. In the very year of the Stonyhurst rescript the Papal States were invaded, and matters went steadily from bad to worse, until the Pope was hustled away to France from one place of confinement to another, until strength and life failed him on August 28, 1799.

The first fifteen years of his successor, Pope Pius VII., the period of the Napoleonic wars, were again disastrous for the

¹ But Dr. Gibson probably did not notice this; for when he referred to his offer later on, in a letter to Father Stone, July 19, 1804, he added with unconscious irony, "I only mention this to show I had no prejudice and was not partial" (*E. P. A., Stone Letters*, 57.)

² B. Ward, *Catholic Revival*, ii. 104.

Church and the Holy See. The Holy Father was in constant trouble with France, Spain, and Naples. Now he was forced into *Concordats* which, though improvements on the previous chaos, and the best that could then be negotiated, contained many harsh and oppressive conditions; now he was a prisoner at Grenoble, Savona, and Fontainebleau. If the expectations of Stonyhurst were long delayed, the main reason for that delay is obvious.

In regard to Russia, where the Government favoured the Society, the Holy Father felt himself more free, and he formally restored the Society in that country, and confirmed it in its privileges by the Brief *Catholicae Fidei*, dated March 7, 1801.

The well-wishers of the Jesuits felt emboldened to go further. Charles Emmanuel obtained leave from Pius VII. while at Foligno on June 29, 1801, to gather together the ex-Jesuits at Naples, and to re-open a novitiate there;¹ and on July 2nd Cardinal Consalvi wrote to Benvenuti, Papal agent at St. Petersburg, announcing that ex-Jesuits in other countries might be aggregated to the Russian Province.²

But Naples was not White Russia, and it was impossible there to take even a first step towards the restoration of the Order without attracting the attention and exciting the jealousy of the Spanish Ministers. On August 8th, the Spanish Ambassador, Vargas, wrote to protest, and the Pope came to the conclusion that the time was not yet ripe for further favours to the Order, and withdrew the permission for a novitiate, which indeed he had only granted secretly by word of mouth. From henceforth he appears to have adopted the fixed policy never to issue written letters either for or against the Jesuits, though *viva voce* he would often encourage them to proceed in hopes of better times. His ministers he seems to have left to their discretion, with the result that different officers took up different lines of policy. Cardinal Consalvi was personally in favour of the Jesuits, but, as might be expected from so great a diplomatist, thought that the assent of the various Governments should be won first. Cardinal Borgia was still the Prefect of Propaganda, and a decided opponent to the Order. It is necessary to notice these diversities of opinion in the Roman Curia, for they reacted powerfully on the ecclesiastical policy adopted by English churchmen.

¹ For the date see Van Duerm, *Conclave de Venise*, p. 571.

² Hughes, *Documents*, I. ii. 187.

Among the first to request aggregation with the Russian Jesuits were the English ex-Jesuits.¹ They had, as we have already seen, expressed the same desire twenty years earlier. As a special precaution, a petition was sent up, asking the Pope's permission, and certain friends of the Order also wrote to the Holy Father to attest that they thought the time not inopportune. Pope Pius gladly gave his consent on December 28, 1802, but, as usual, only by word of mouth. *Vadano pure, ma in vestito secolare come prima; e basta per ora.*—"Let them by all means; but in lay-dress as they used to do. That will do for the present."² This news was sent on to England by the then Father General from Russia, March 1, 1803, with a commission appointing Father Stone Provincial. He entered into office on May 27, 1803.³ It is, therefore, from this day that we must date the commencement of the restored English Province of the Society. On September 27th, twelve young men were sent to the neighbouring house, "Hodder Place," where they began their novitiate. Their religious character, however, was kept in the background. They were called "Juniors," and a preparatory school was opened in the same place, at the same time, in order still further to avoid the appearance of a Religious community.

Though these proceedings were kept as secret as possible, in accordance with the Pope's express command, too many persons were concerned for the matter to remain absolutely hidden, and Father Stone was rightly concerned about giving notice of what he had done to the Vicars Apostolic. He had, from the first, endeavoured to procure an announcement of it from Rome itself. But as this could not be obtained, he wrote on the day he renewed his vows to Dr. Milner, who, that same day, May 22, 1803, had been consecrated Bishop, asking advice whether notice of the matter should be sent to the other Vicars. Milner must have written encouragingly, for Stone, shortly afterwards,

¹ Father Strickland first mooted the matter in a letter of August 13, 1801. *E.P.A., Strickland Letters*. The actual petition does not seem to be on record.

² The answer was attested by Padre Vincenzo Giorgi, a theologian of the Penitentiaria. It was reported in Latin to Father Stone by Father Grüber, March 1, 1803, and the *ipsissima verba* are given in Brzozowski to Baron Paul de Wandewrecken, July 20, 1812. *E.P.A., Epp. Gen.*, 27; and *Miscell.* 173.

³ The exact day is variously given. Oliver and Foley in their lists of Provincials, give the feast of the Ascension, May 19. But Oliver, in his biography of Stone, gives May 27. This date is confirmed by manuscript sources, which, moreover, place Father Stone's profession on May 22nd.

June 27, 1803, informed their Lordships of the Pope's *viva voce* permission to the ex-Jesuits to renew their vows, and that he and a few others had taken advantage of this, and that he hoped the Father General would petition His Holiness to signify his approbation in a more direct manner.

How this letter was answered, I do not know. In the expectation of further news from Rome, a declaration of policy at this time may have seemed superfluous. An inquiry, however, was ere long sent up there by the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Troy. He was a distinct friend of the Order, but felt it his duty to find out from Propaganda, whether the Fathers at Stonyhurst had the power to receive young men from Ireland into their novitiate, as they were doing, together with certain funds, which would, after the deaths of the Irish ex-Jesuits, have descended to the Irish Bishops, in case the Jesuit Mission should not revive.¹

Propaganda, under Cardinal Borgia, was, as we have seen, unfriendly to the Society, and on December 3, 1803, the Cardinal Prefect wrote to the Vicars bidding them "not to recognize those who wished to be Jesuits in England, nor to admit their privileges, supposing they claim any, unless the Vicars Apostolic are first certified of the legitimate existence [of the Society], and this by the authority of the Holy See through the Congregation de Propaganda Fide." In February Bishop Gibson wrote to Father Stone conveying to him the substance of this command. "It is painful for me to write any communication that may be contrary to your inclinations or those of any others: but all must see what is incumbent on me. You know the regard I have for the gentlemen at Stonyhurst, and I shall only add that I never wrote a word to Rome." It was only in 1808 that Father Stone learnt that Dr. Troy had given the occasion for the rescript.²

¹ The young men did eventually return as Jesuit priests to Ireland, and the fund (Callaghan bequest) was made over to them (? 1816). But during their long Jesuit training, the Archbishop (not at all unnaturally) thought it his duty to keep a vigilant eye on the money in question, and after the year 1807 (when Father Callaghan died), it seemed as though a quarrel between him and Father Stone might ensue, and the matter was again referred to Propaganda by the Archbishop. But it was not till the year 1810 that Propaganda wrote to ask Father Stone for an explanation. This was sent April 29, 1810, and ensured the maintenance of the *status quo*, until the formation of the Irish Scholastics was completed. See Father Hughes's summary of the evidence, *Documents* I. ii. 1148-1153. Father Stone's letter to Dr. Troy, April 23, 1808, *E.P.A.*, *Stone Letters* should also be quoted.

² Cardinal Borgia's letter is known to me by extracts only; Glover, p. 32, following Gradwell's *Documenta*, n. viii. Gibson's letter is quoted in Stone to Strickland, February 25, 1803, *E.P.A.*, *Stone Letters*, 35, 37.

Father Stone, who was in touch with Jesuits of other countries, and had heard before of similar mandates from Cardinals in seeming contradiction with the Pope's private declarations, was not misled by it as to the true position of affairs. He had received repeated assurances from the Father General that the Holy Father approved all that the English Jesuits had so far done, and he was aware that the Holy Father might have reasons for not communicating his will even to Propaganda. It did escape him that Cardinal Borgia spoke of "admitting privileges," and of recognizing the existence of the Jesuits as "legitimate." If the Pope had really meant to show disapproval of what he knew had been done, he would certainly have spoken in very different terms.¹

For Father Stone the upshot of the whole was (and in the sequel his judgment was confirmed again and again) that his vows were a sacred obligation, for they had been taken with the approval of the Pope; but they were secret, and must be kept such. He must not ask to have "privileges of the Order admitted," or to have its "existence recognized as legitimate." So he answered Bishop Gibson that as "Cardinal Borgia is no doubt the minister of the Holy See for this kingdom, submission is due to his orders. I therefore assure your Lordship that I shall pay all proper deference to his despatch, which you have communicated to me."²

But while the Jesuit leaders maintained their presence of mind and stood firm, it can cause no wonder if some of the rank and file were upset at the reproof from Propaganda. A Jesuit of the old Society, Father Christopher Rose, intending to re-enter the restored Order, was in the middle of his retreat when the letter came; whereupon he immediately gave up his proposal, and several followed his example.

J. H. POLLEN.

(To be continued.)

¹ Father Stone's mind is explained in his letter to Father Strickland, May 9, 1809, *E.P.A., Stone Letters*, 91.

² *E.P.A., Stone*, 41, a copy sent to Strickland. Fol. 40. i, is Father Charles Plowden's suggested draft, much more elaborate. Fol. 47 b is Stone's draft of the copy sent to Mr. Thomas Weld. In *E.P.A., Miscell.* is a draft of the copy sent to Father General Kareu. The latter adds explanations and further arguments in sense described above.

"La Terreur Blanche."

THE Franco-British *Entente*, of which we have recently heard so much, is doubtless understood by many persons as binding them to extend to the present rulers of France the feelings of amity which all must rejoice to see entertained for the French people; so that many Englishmen think themselves obliged to accord to the most arbitrary actions of the Republican Government a degree of tolerance, and even approval, of which they would not think in the case of political opponents amongst their own countrymen. It almost necessarily follows that inasmuch as the Third Republic not only proclaims its lineal descent from the First, but loses no opportunity of showing by its deeds that the claim is not an empty one, attempts should be made to clear the memory of the original revolutionists from some of the odium which by the common verdict of mankind has attached to them, or, if they cannot be entirely whitewashed, to persuade the world that they were at least far less objectionable than the nobles and clergy upon whom they made war, in the same spirit which animates their successors.

We find in consequence that attempts are made to vindicate the policy, in particular the anti-clerical or irreligious policy, of those who now control the nation, from the charge of illiberal intolerance, by showing that those who suffer under it indulged when they had the chance in excesses no less atrocious, which they would certainly again commit were they to gain the upper hand, and that it is a mere matter of common prudence to adopt every precaution which may serve to obviate such a misfortune. Accordingly, against the "Red Terror" of Danton and Robespierre, we are bidden to set what it has become the fashion to style the "White Terror" of the Restoration in 1815.

The point is distinctly urged by Mr. Arthur Galton in an address before the Victoria Institute in April, 1909.¹

¹ *Journal of Transactions*, xli. 145.

Everybody [he said] talks glibly enough about the Reign of Terror. Few Englishmen realize what caused that terror, which was perfectly genuine and only too well founded; and still fewer know anything about the wholesale atrocities committed by the abominable White Terror, *i.e.*, by partisans of the pope, the bishops, and the nobles.

To like effect speaks M. de Vaulabelle:¹

The royalist and Catholic party without the slightest provocation imbrued its hands, in 1815, in the blood of the Protestants. It was monarchical and Catholic fanaticism which produced these natural fruits.

Assertions of such gravity thus confidently made necessarily invite examination, satisfactory materials for which will be found less abundant than might be desired, for contemporaries have almost entirely neglected the subject, and those who have treated it at a later date exhibit their sympathy with one or other of the opposing parties, on which account their evidence is naturally suspect; except, indeed, in cases when it tells against their own side, or is supported by documents to which no exception can be taken.² There remain, however, certain broad facts which are beyond dispute, and have an important bearing upon the question at issue.

That many acts of violence were committed by the victorious royalists in 1815 is undeniable, to which not a few Bonapartists, republicans, and Protestants fell victims, and it seems that in many instances little or no effort was made by those who had the power either to check such excesses or to bring the perpetrators to justice. What we have to enquire, however, is to whom such crimes were due;—can they be rightly attributed, as we have been told, to the royalists and Catholics in general, the partisans of the Pope, the Bishops, and the nobles? In other words, were the restored Bourbons responsible, abetted and encouraged by the clergy and nobility, and employing the authority of government to persecute their adversaries?

In considering this matter, it must be borne in mind that undoubtedly the crimes committed were confined to one region

¹ *Histoire des deux Restaurations.*

² The principal sources of information are: *Nettement*, *History*, and *Souvenirs of the Restoration*; E. Daudet, *History of the same* (both of these write in the royalist interest); Lacretelle, Capéfigue, and Lamartine, in their respective *Histories of the epoch*. De Vaulabelle and H. Houssaye deal with the same period from the opposite point of view; the last named, who is a militant Bonapartist and anti-clerical, styling this portion of his history "*La France Crucifiée.*"

in the south of France, their principal scenes being the towns of Nîmes and Usès, in the Department of Le Gard, Avignon, and Marseilles. In Paris, the seat of government, the White Terror, unlike the Red, found no place; and although Marshal Ney and some others were executed under the judgment of courts martial for desertion to the enemy and violation of their solemn engagements, their fate, whatever may be thought of it, had nothing to do with the reign of terror of which we have been told. The murder of Marshal Brune, at Avignon, and General Ramel, at Toulouse, were of quite a different character, and could pretend no form of law.

In the southern districts, where these and other outrages were committed, not only are the populations notoriously more excitable than elsewhere, and passions easily aroused, but—especially in the old province of Languedoc—a bitter feud had for centuries divided the Catholics and the Huguenots, between whom there was never a real peace, but at best only an armistice. At the period in question, circumstances had greatly embittered their hostility. The south had in great measure been adverse to Napoleon and his rule, and on his way to Elba, after his first deposition, the ex-Emperor had with some difficulty been secured from the violence of those who attributed to him the miseries they had long resented. After his return from Elba, and during the Hundred Days, the now triumphant Bonapartists did nothing to conciliate their opponents, but, over and above the requisitions, of men and money which the Emperor in his desperate need was forced to levy on an already exhausted people, his followers frequently signalized their brief supremacy by making their adversaries taste to the full the bitterness of defeat. At Arpaillargues, for instance, royalist troops who had been disbanded and disarmed were fired upon in defiance of the terms of capitulation, and some of their number brutally butchered. Even after the final catastrophe of Waterloo the soldiers still devoted to Napoleon did not accept the situation, and in various cases offered violence to the royal troops or their flag. At Nîmes, July 17th, Louis XVIII., having by this time entered Paris, they opened with artillery upon an unarmed throng, killing several. On the next day the populace fired on these soldiers, who were in retreat, and at least thirty of these were killed or wounded. On the eve of elections for the new legislature, July 19th, five persons were killed at Nîmes, and within the ensuing fortnight

fourteen in all. On August 25th a priest was killed by Protestants.

It has been acknowledged that the more influential royalists do not seem, at least in some cases, to have done all they could to check outrage on the part of the populace, but we may seek in vain for any evidence that they promoted or stimulated the passions of the mob. On the contrary, in the most notable instances they did the contrary and used all their authority to repress popular fury and protect those who were likely to be its victims. King Louis XVIII. himself published in the *Moniteur*¹ an appeal to all his adherents to do all in their power in furtherance of domestic peace and tranquillity, and his nephew, the Duke d'Angoulême, commanding the royal troops in the provinces where disturbances were most serious, exerted himself strenuously in the same direction. On this subject, M. Lamartine, certainly by no means a devoted royalist, thus writes :

The King deplored these crimes committed under pretence of zeal inflaming his adherents in the provinces. While he did not venture to employ severe measures against his friends, he was ashamed to tolerate criminals. He despatched to Nîmes General Count Lagarde, a man who was enough of a diplomatist skilfully to combine royalist sentiments with the impartial re-establishment of order and the protection of the victims which were the object of his mission.

In consequence of his exertions to this effect, the Count was assaulted by furious royalist partisans and desperately wounded. The case of General Ramel, already mentioned, was similar. He was in the service of Louis XVIII., but having vigorously exerted himself to repress violence at Toulouse, he was in consequence murdered by so-called royalists. The efforts of the Duke d'Angoulême were likewise in great measure abortive.

At Marseilles, where the first excesses were committed just a week after Waterloo (June 25th), we are told by Capefigues, whose father had been amongst those slain, that there was no official sanction for the massacres, and by Lacretelle that, whereas this city had always been notoriously anti-Bonapartist, no plea of religion was raised.

It must not be forgotten that at this time the Government was almost entirely destitute of resources to vindicate its authority. The army, which had almost entirely gone over to

¹ July 20, 1815.

Napoleon, had of necessity been disbanded after his defeat, and within the space of a couple of months it was not possible to enrol and organize an effective force to take its place. Save the authority of the victorious allies, who did not concern themselves with the internal dissensions of French parties, and who in particular were not likely to interfere with those whose offence was opposition to the monarch they had restored, the preservation of order had to be chiefly entrusted to the National Guard, which in the disturbed districts naturally shared to a large extent the very passions which had to be repressed.

Under such conditions, however deplorable was the violence committed, it is not very wonderful that the beaten party should feel the vengeance of the hot-headed antagonists who had so suddenly found themselves triumphant and liberated from extreme apprehension. As a matter of course, also, the victorious party was swelled by adventurers and blackguards of all kinds, who seized so good an opportunity to gratify their love of plunder, or gratify private animosities.

Here we have what appears to be a quite sufficient explanation of what actually took place, without having recourse to such highly coloured accounts as we began by considering. Mr. Galton, as we have heard, speaks of the wholesale atrocities committed by the abominable White Terror—that is to say, by the partisans of the Pope, the Bishops, and the nobles. M. de Vaulabelle is even more explicit, telling us that so well were the outrages organized that, as a rule at least, they were suspended on holidays—presumably to let those committing them go to church. He also declares that bodies of workmen used to sing a song in which they boasted that they would wash their hands in Protestant gore.

It would likewise appear from the rather rhetorical style adopted by such writers that they aim at an eloquent exposition of events rather than at accuracy. At Marseilles, for instance, especial stress is laid upon the case of the "Mamelukes," who had accompanied Bonaparte from Egypt, apparently out of mere devotion to his person. They were accordingly massacred wholesale, according to various accounts, so that the kennels ran with their blood, and the waters of the harbour were empurpled by it. On the other hand, Daudet states that the total number thus slain was thirteen, and Lacretelle that their body was made up of adventurers from Italy and Southern France, as well as the Levant, and that they had made them-

selves odious by breaking the windows of all who would not illuminate on the news of the Battle of Ligny, which at first was announced as a great French victory.

Finally, there can be no comparison between the actual facts of the two epochs which it is sought to compare. As Chateaubriand said to the original revolutionists, say what they would, and do what they would, the lion's share of crime must always be theirs. And, as M. Nettement adds, a single day in 1793 witnessed the death of more persons than the whole period of reaction which in the South of France followed the excesses of the Hundred Days.

The conclusion which it seems reasonable to draw is thus by no means in accord with that of Mr. Galton and those whom he follows, and may be summed up in the words of M. de Castelnau, a Protestant and captain of a ship of war, who tells us that the acts of violence in question must in fairness be ascribed to men of the lower orders, who, in his words,¹

too faithful to the maxims of their class, regarded as the most incontestable of their rights that of revenging themselves upon their fellows, for excesses committed by these during the Hundred Days. Had none been persecuted but nobles and priests, there would have been no reprisals.

That the Pope and the Bishops in particular instigated or abetted the outbreaks there seems to be no evidence discoverable, except on the general principle that every evil must be due to them.

J. G.

¹ Nettement, *Souvenirs*, p. 300.

Lord Kelvin. 1826—1907.

ON December 17, 1907, at his country residence of Netherhall, in Scotland, there passed from this life William Thomson, Baron Kelvin of Largs; and one more of the intellectual lights of the world was extinguished. A leader of leaders in scientific thought, in intellectual stature head and shoulders above his fellows, of authority unchallenged in his own domain, of unrivalled influence, he achieved an eminence in science which we venture to assert has not been surpassed in this country since the days of Newton.

The not unnatural desire for a nearer acquaintance with a man so remarkable has lately been satisfied by the publication in two splendid volumes of *The Life of Lord Kelvin*,¹ by Professor Silvanus P. Thompson. The author has brought enthusiasm, sympathy, and judgment to his task, and the outcome is a biography of fascinating interest from beginning to end.

The perusal of the book convinces one of the appropriateness of the metaphor recently used by Professor J. A. Ewing, F.R.S., who in a lecture² compared Kelvin's work to a mighty cathedral set in the centre of a busy city, and incapable, because hemmed in on all sides by shabby dwelling-houses and grimy office-buildings, of being viewed as a whole from any single direction. Indeed, the mere statement that the titles of Kelvin's contributions to theoretical and practical science fill fifty pages of Silvanus Thompson's new book would sufficiently indicate the futility of any attempt in this small compass at a detailed description of his life and work. Nevertheless, the general reader who without scientific training would find much of the new book unappetizing, will perhaps not be ungrateful for an endeavour to select the most interesting characteristics in Kelvin's career, and to call attention to points which are of universal and permanent value. For from Kelvin's life, as from

¹ Macmillan and Co. 1910. 2 vols. pp. xx, xi, 1296. Price 30s. net.

² Institute of Electrical Engineers, January 13th.

the careers of Bacon, of Newton, and of Pasteur, besides the stimulus which we receive from the sight of great talents greatly employed, we may gain much to support sound philosophy and true religion, and many a weapon for the discomfiture of the pseudo-scientific rationalist.

In 1846, William Thomson, when but twenty years of age, was elected to the Chair of Natural Philosophy in Glasgow University, a post which he retained till his resignation in 1899. He began his first session without a laboratory, without instruments, without endowment, without money, without favour from his superiors, but with tremendous earnestness and zeal, with a grim determination to create new interests in his own department, and with a conviction that here would be found his true vocation. In addition he possessed, as we now know, an endowment of mental talents that must have brought him to eminence in almost any sphere.

At the outset of his career, moreover, he could boast two rare advantages. Firstly, he had the very highest mathematical equipment, for, whilst at Cambridge, he had been announced as "Second Wrangler" and "First Smith's Prizeman." His ability was so well known that his failure to be "Senior Wrangler" proved a great disappointment to his friends and family, though he himself had not been at all confident of success. The Rev. Stephen Parkinson, who carried off the premier honours that year, is said to have owed his triumph to his marvellous facility in writing out "book-work," which, unfortunately, under the old regulations counted very heavily. Parkinson was, however, easily out-distanced in the Smith's prizes, which are awarded for mathematical attainments of a different but higher class. We may note, incidentally, to show that his development was not one-sided, that during his 'Varsity course Thomson was an enthusiastic oarsman, rowing occasionally for his college boat, and once winning the Colquhoun silver sculls; also that he was exceedingly fond of music, played the French horn with some skill, and became one of the founders of the University Musical Society.

Thomson's second enviable advantage was the care and influence exercised by his father, Professor James Thomson, who held the Chair of Mathematics in Glasgow University. Possessing the national inheritance of shrewdness in an exceptional degree, and perceiving that his son's comparative ignorance of experimental methods in the laboratory would be

a serious obstacle to the latter's candidature for the Chair of Natural Philosophy, soon likely to be vacant, he very early took efficient steps to remove the difficulty. When young Thomson's University course was over, his father sent him to the continent with introductions to all the leading French and German scientific men of the day, and with instructions to keep his eyes and ears wide open, and to lose no opportunity of making up his deficiency in practical work and of cultivating a closer acquaintance with the various professors. His willing compliance brought him into touch with Dumas, Liouville, Sturm, Chasles, Cauchy, Biot, Regnault, and others of scarcely less eminence, intercourse with whom had naturally a powerful educative influence on his mind. The method was perhaps old-fashioned, but we may regret that now-a-days the value of such an acquaintance with leading men in the case of young aspirants to scientific distinction is not more widely recognized; it teaches a becoming modesty, brings new knowledge straight, as it were, from the intellectual mill, broadens the outlook, engenders sympathy, and inspires enthusiasm for work.

Returning to England, and still under his father's watchful eye, he called on Faraday at the Royal Institution and quietly made mental notes of all that the famous laboratory had to show. Conversations with Faraday and the French mathematicians had already set Thomson's young brain working, and he realized vividly both that a vast territory in mathematical and experimental physics remained still unexplored, and that the pioneer work already accomplished was feeble, faulty, and limited; convictions which stimulated his own desire to see sooner or later all that region mapped out completely.

The testimonials he collected during the tour secured Thomson's election, as we have said, to the vacant Chair of Physics, and his old father had the joy and pride of welcoming his son as fellow-professor in October, 1846. During the school year, which lasted till May, the new Professor was too engrossed in the work of class-lecturing to find time for his own research, but the generously long vacation from May till October—would that every professor could get such a one—gave him ample leisure for private investigations, and ever after nearly all his best work was done during this annual interval.

It is with extreme reluctance that on account of their number and variety we are compelled to leave the majority of these researches unconsidered; yet it would argue a lack of just

appreciation were we to omit mention of one or two prominent questions of vast theoretical significance with which Thomson's name is intimately associated. We shall, therefore, devote a brief space to the consideration of two great principles which lie at the very foundations of modern physical speculation, and in the establishment of which Thomson took a very conspicuous part, namely, the Law of Transformation of Heat Energy (or the second Law of Thermodynamics), and the Principle of the Dissipation of Energy. A tribute of special praise is due to Professor Silvanus Thompson for his admirable chapter on Thermodynamics in vol. i. of the *Life*. The steady growth in the early nineteenth century of the new ideas which combated the old doctrine that the invisible agency called *heat* was a material substance, imponderable, indestructible, uncreatable, can be traced partly to the stimulation given by the experiments of Count Rumford and Sir Humphrey Davy, but mainly to the effect of a treatise on the Motive Power of Heat written in 1824 by Sadi Carnot, a French engineer, and unearthed by Thomson in 1845.

The essential points about Carnot's investigations in Thermodynamics, which to the general reader would be very abstruse, are contained sufficiently for our purpose in the following two assertions—first, that in a steam-engine no heat is *destroyed* in the stroke of the piston, and secondly, that heat is available for work only when allowed to fall through a certain range of temperature. Carnot at this time held the caloric or material theory of heat, and what he meant may be gathered from the analogy of a measured quantity of water working a mill wheel which falls from the higher level to the lower, but is not decreased in quantity.

Immensely struck with Carnot's work, Thomson himself began to develop the theory of the steam-engine with wonderful skill, and it is in the conquering of the enormous difficulties which arose during his investigations that we are presented with a picture of the man at his very best.

Between the years 1842 and 1850, James Prescott Joule, a young Manchester brewer, who had turned his attention to the new science, completed a startling set of experiments which went to show that Carnot's theorem was unsound, that heat was *actually destroyed* in the expansion of steam against a piston, and, moreover, in a definite measurable proportion to the work done in the stroke. The announcement by Joule of the new

views was very coldly received in high scientific quarters, for they challenged the accepted theory of the material nature of heat, and tended to revolutionize the whole doctrine of its motive power.

For eight years Thomson held out against the experimental evidence. He was so convinced by Carnot's seemingly irrefragable reasoning, and, on the other hand, was so struck by the apparent impossibility of escape from Joule's observations that his mind was in a state of utter perplexity. Yet it was a marked characteristic of Thomson that he would take practically nothing scientific on authority alone, and he was never satisfied till he had thought the whole question out for himself from beginning to end. He must see and understand the steps one by one, and would take no leaps in the dark; he was infinitely painstaking in all such work, and this feature reveals one, at least, of the secrets of his power and success, and is in striking contrast to the reckless precipitation of some latter-day investigators.

He therefore took Carnot's theorems and Joule's experiments; criticized their assumptions, turned and twisted the arguments, built and destroyed, rebuilt and extended, considered suggested reconciliations by Rankine and Clausius, and finally deliberately and humbly surrendered to Joule. There never was a grander illustration of scientific honesty. Thomson's struggle did not, however, end in mere submission to Joule; for he had made conquests in the strife the issues of which were of momentous importance. He published his conclusions in March, 1851, and formulated two propositions on which depended, as he asserted, the whole theory of the motive power of heat. These two propositions are known as the first and second law of Thermodynamics. The first law is a particular case of the Conservation of Energy, a principle announced about the same time by von Helmholtz. The second law, which, as we stated above, is of such consequence in physical theory, merits some attention. It depends for its demonstration on a postulate proposed in one form by Clausius of Zurich, but much more fundamentally by Thomson. This postulate may be most conveniently stated by asserting that on the molecular theory of heat it is impossible by inanimate agencies to deal with the molecules of a body one by one and deprive them of all their heat-energy by bringing them individually to rest. We must in practice deal with matter in the molar state, and

use average effects of molecular motions, not individual effects. A picture of what is meant may be gathered from the analogy of the utter helplessness of a man's attempting to harness to work a herd of wild horses dashing madly in every direction over a vast plain. The postulate is of the nature of a negation, a definite limit being assigned to the engineering capacities of man: further, it is restricted explicitly by Thomson to inanimate agencies, so that, for instance, Maxwell's "demons" are excluded. Its truth is not rigorously demonstrable from first principles, but is found to be, so far, consonant with facts: thus it is almost purely pragmatic.

Thomson followed up these generalizations by another of scarcely less significance both to the philosopher and to the physicist. His paper on *The Universal Tendency in Nature to the Dissipation of Energy* was published in 1852. Though devoting his analysis mainly to the inevitable and irrevocable waste of heat-energy in a steam-engine, he applies the idea to the earth viewed as a working system, and states the three celebrated propositions, the third of which predicts the final destiny of the earth:

(1) There is at present in the material world a universal tendency to the dissipation of mechanical energy.

(2) Any *restoration* of mechanical energy without more than an equivalent of dissipation is impossible in inanimate material processes and is probably never effected by means of *organized matter*, either endowed with vegetable life or subjected to the will of an animated creature.

(3) Within a finite period of time past, the earth must have been, and, within a finite period of time to come, the earth must again be, unfit for the habitation of man as at present constituted, unless operations have been or are to be performed, which are impossible under laws to which the known operations going on at present in the material world are subject.

The general truth of these pronouncements, which have been the theme of endless controversy and discussion, has never been seriously combated, but a disquisition on their bearing on philosophy would take us too far beyond the scope of this paper. With their statement, therefore, we shall dismiss Thomson's contributions to Thermodynamics and pass on to other matters.

The rest of Thomson's life-work has both a popular and an academic aspect. He will be remembered best, no doubt, in

the popular mind for his share in laying and perfecting the first Atlantic cable and for his practical assistance to navigation, while the scientific will be attracted by his theory of the constitution of matter.

Professor Silvanus Thompson has devoted two chapters of vol. i. to the story of the cable, and the recital is intensely interesting, not merely because of the picture it affords of the facing and conquering of great difficulties by a strong man, but further because of the evidence conveyed of Thomson's invaluable contribution to the industrial prosperity and social comfort of the nation. We who enjoy the fruits of their talents and industry are too apt to forget the services of such men, and to neglect the expression of our gratitude for their self-sacrifice, continued, as it so frequently is, against heart-sickening opposition.

The early partial successes in 1849 and 1851 of laying short lengths of cable had stirred the ambitions of telegraph engineers and raised their hopes of spanning even the great Atlantic. But confronting such a project were vast obstacles. The weight and cost of over 2,000 miles of thick copper wire were prodigious. There was a dispute as to whether the cable should be protected by an external armouring of iron wires or not. Its manufacture required new machinery and the creation of a new class of operatives. The laying of such a cable across an ocean known to be in places three miles deep presented an engineering problem of the greatest complexity. No single ship existed of sufficient size to hold the cable if it were constructed. In addition to and above all this, supervened the electrical objection that the speed of transmission through such a length was believed to be very slow, a circumstance which if true might make the undertaking unremunerative. A company was, however, formed in 1856, with Thomson as a director. At first he held no official position, but soon the innumerable initial difficulties occasioned his appointment as consulting engineer, and finally, owing to the incompetence of the chief engineer, promotion to a higher standing.

Valencia on this side, and Newfoundland on the other, were the two terminal stations selected, and operations began in 1857. The number of faults and failures was very disheartening; the first line, laid in 1858, soon became useless, and not until 1865 was capital found to make another attempt successful. During the interval till July 28, 1866, when the shore-end of

the cable was landed in triumph from the *Great Eastern* at Heart's Content Bay, the British nation watched Thomson as Bruce watched the spider. Six distinct attempts and as many partial failures attended the untiring efforts of the gallant engineers, and the fact that the project was continued at all was mainly due to the emphatic assertion of Thomson that the feat was certainly possible. Even when the cable was down the excessive feebleness of the signals was a further almost insurmountable obstacle, to overcome which Thomson invented the world-famed mirror-galvanometer and siphon-recorder. Universal jubilation greeted the final victory, and congratulations poured in from England, America, and the Continent, whilst Her Majesty the Queen expressed her approbation by conferring on Thomson the honour of knighthood. To complete an account of Sir William's practical assistance to navigation we should have to describe his numerous inventions in aid of the sailor, such as his compass, now on almost every ship afloat, his deep-sea sounding apparatus, his improvements in light-house signalling, and his professional advice to the Admiralty on the design of battleships, advice which extended to the construction even of the Dreadnoughts. The pecuniary benefits accruing to him from his discoveries enabled him to purchase in 1870 the *Lalla Rookh*, a smart sailing-yacht of 126 tons, and by the possession of this craft, which he used practically throughout every succeeding vacation, he acquired at first-hand a most intimate knowledge of seamanship, which not only guided his inventions into practical channels, but also made his opinion of navigation problems that of an expert.

As a theorist on the constitution of matter, Lord Kelvin's place is almost unique, and we must again thank the author of the *Life* for a most excellent chapter in Vol. ii. which enables us to acquire a very complete grasp of the great physicist's views on a topic of the very first importance, and incidentally to see another illustration of that scientific candour and honesty which was such a notable feature in his character.

Right at the outset of his career, influenced as he was by the study of Newton's *Principia*, Lord Kelvin (to give him now the title he received in 1892) conceived the desire, which remained with him through life, of finding a great comprehensive theory of matter which should give some sort of explanation, based on purely dynamical principles, of all the known

"properties" of inorganic matter. Up to this time, its ultimate physical structure, its elasticity and compressibility, its optical, electric, thermic and magnetic qualities were totally unexplained. These qualities must be, he argued, capable of explanation; they must in some way depend upon the arrangement and mutual actions of the molecules of its structure, or upon the structure and properties of the molecules themselves, or upon their relation to the all-pervading ether of space. To be the Newton of the molecular theory, which should afford a dynamical account of all these properties, such was his lofty ambition.

In trying to get at Kelvin's mind on this point of the theory of matter, one realizes the defect arising from his lack of acquaintance with Philosophy, and it appears certain that he was not fully alive to the nature of his implicit assumptions. It may certainly be doubted whether he kept an accurate distinction between the physically ultimate and the philosophically ultimate, whether he recognized clearly that the question of the ultimate nature of matter in its entirety involves the Philosophy of mass, time, force, extension, quantity, and quality, notions with which as such the physicist does not deal.

Be this as it may, he made the attempt to devise a molecular machinery which by its motions and inter-actions should give rise to the same phenomena in nature as those we actually observe. He was, in fact, searching for a working model of the assumed atom, but it is not a little perplexing to understand what exactly he understood by his model. Did he think he was solving the actual problem of the inside and outside of an atom, or was he merely trying to devise mechanical models which should exhibit the same phenomena as the actual atoms, if they be and whatever they be, *de facto* exhibit? In view of many scattered remarks in his speeches and writings, it would seem certain that he never hoped to achieve anything beyond the second supposition.

However, he was unsparing in his efforts after success. Side by side with superb mathematical analysis he exercised the marvellous fertility and ingenuity of his imagination in fashioning fundamental models of the atom; vortex atom, Bosovich atom, electron atom, all were pressed into service: he carried out multitudinous laboratory experiments with extraordinary care, from which he drew his conclusions with extreme caution. He took into account other people's researches; for

instance, he was immensely impressed by the phenomena of Crookes' tubes, Röntgen rays, electrolysis, electro-magnetic waves, and radio-activity. With almost feverish energy and anxiety he wrote and spoke about his work to every one of his scientific acquaintances. He seems to have done all that was humanly possible to elucidate a problem of exceptional fascination, and the solution of which was and is still desired by the whole scientific world. Consequently we look for his conclusions with no ordinary interest and confidence, for his pronouncements carry a weight which no other name could confer. What, then, was his final decision? It was contained in a sentence uttered by him at his Jubilee in 1896, and a sentence which fell on his audience like a thunderbolt.

One word [he said¹] characterizes the most strenuous efforts for the advancement of science that I have made perseveringly during fifty-five years: that word is *failure*. I know no more of electric and magnetic force, or of the relation between ether, electricity, and ponderable matter, or of chemical affinity, than I knew and tried to teach to my students of natural philosophy fifty years ago in my first session as Professor.

Yes; Failure. That is the frank confession of Lord Kelvin, the greatest authority in Physics of last century. For him dynamics was entirely inadequate to explain even the most elementary and universal of the properties of matter. In a letter to Professor FitzGerald in 1896 he wrote:² "If we could get but the slightest inkling of how a fragment of paper jumps to rubbed sealing-wax, or a fragment of iron to a lode-stone, I could be supremely happy. . . ."

In the same letter he says: "I now abandon everything I have ever thought of or written in respect to the constitution of ether."

No less striking is the following sentence in a letter to Professor Leahy in 1896:³ "No one has come within a million miles of explaining any one phenomenon of electrostatics or magnetism by hydro-dynamical theory."

In Kelvin's eyes no physical theory at all held the field, and he even rejected explicitly the celebrated vortex-atom⁴ theory, regarded by many as peculiarly his own. Reluctantly, regret-

¹ P. 984, vol. ii.

² P. 1071, vol. ii.

³ P. 1064, vol. ii.

⁴ *Phil. Mag.*, May, 1887.

fully, yet with sincerity, he made his confession, and at the same time the confession of science. That confession was, however, tempered by a protestation, almost passionate, that there was still some explanation to be found of the mystery, and in this there is left a shred of hope to his successors. He maintained his fundamental principles, though their application to the theory of matter had failed. He believed firmly in the existence of the ether as a vehicle of energy, and in the kinetic theory of gases in its bald outlines, but developments beyond and from these were for him obscured, as he asserted in no uncertain voice, in impenetrable darkness.

We must now perforce leave all Lord Kelvin's other theoretic work untouched, and make an end of this sketch by a few remarks on his personal character and views, gathered partly from scattered passages in Silvanus Thompson's book, especially chapter xxi. in vol. ii., and partly from the reminiscences of Lord Kelvin's sister, Mrs. Elizabeth King, which she has collected in her book *Lord Kelvin's Early Home*.

He had a very happy home, and was made much of by his brothers and sisters both for his good looks—as a young man he was strikingly handsome—and his charming disposition. In later life, though always very amiable and easy of access his thoughts were often far away, engrossed in physical problems, and the company not unfrequently were a little embarrassed. As a lecturer he paid the penalty of his genius, and was scarcely a success, for he found it impossible to adhere to any methodic exposition. At the slightest provocation off he would go at a tangent, and no one know when he would return. Students were terrified when he entered the laboratory and began to handle their apparatus, for his excitability usually resulted in damage to whatever was breakable.

His great friendship for the collected, easy-going Professor Tait, of Edinburgh, in collaboration with whom he began a never-finished *Treatise on Natural Philosophy*, was one of the unaccountable things in human nature. Tait's letters to him are full of fun and pleasant banter, containing such sentiments as the following: "The only profitable conversation [is] that at which either science or tobacco is freely admitted—their union being the nearest sublunary approximation to perfection." Lord Kelvin, on his side, shows few signs of the possession of humour. In religion, it is to his credit that he always remained a firm believer in Christianity, although his piety did not transcend the severe Scotch Presbyterian type.

Having little conception of the absolute nature of revelation, and naturally making little account of the doctrinal differences of the sects, he would attend service at almost any church. We read with a thrill that M. Cauchy tried hard to convert him to Catholicism, but in vain: his national prejudices and upbringing caused him to look with disdain on anything savouring of ritualism and the priesthood.

Modern men of science who profess atheism and agnosticism cannot away with this stout champion of theism, so they must ascribe to the hardest and clearest thinker amongst them what they call a "theological bias." But his testimony goes far to destroy the antagonism which such men would set up between science and religion. Again and again in his public utterances he declared his belief in a Creative Power and in an overruling Providence. He even asserted that his purely scientific studies had brought him a direct demonstration of a definite creation, but they are not demonstrations which everyone would accept. Once, on hearing of Darwin's¹ disbelief in divine revelation and evidence of design, he vehemently denounced such views as utterly unscientific, and maintained that our power of discussing and speculating about atheism and materialism was enough to disprove them. It is worth recording that he regarded the question of life, however certainly its operations were in accordance with chemical and dynamical laws, as essentially outside the range of physics. "The influence of animal or vegetable life,"² he declared, "is infinitely beyond the range of any scientific inquiry hitherto entered on." Or again: "The real phenomena of life infinitely transcend human science."³ On the question of free-will, for instance, he declared that so far as physics was concerned it was a miracle. For this statement he was violently attacked by the materialists.

In a memorable speech made at University College, London, in 1903, he uttered the following words:

Do not be afraid of being free-thinkers. If you think strongly enough you will be forced by science to the belief in God which is the foundation of all religion. You will find science not antagonistic, but helpful to religion.⁴

Much might be added which would help still further to make clear the emphatically orthodox position assumed by

¹ Vol. ii. p. 1090.

² Vol. ii. p. 1093.

³ Vol. ii. p. 1093.

⁴ Vol. ii. p. 1099.

Lord Kelvin on a topic of such vital interest to the race and the individual, but the foregoing testimony must suffice. To the last he remained steadfast to these convictions. Just before his death he said he did not think that any other man had spent as much time as himself in the perusal of Professor Rutherford's *Radio-activity*, and yet none of the wonderful revelations of the potentialities of matter contained in that book made him swerve in the slightest from his profession of faith in a God-made, God-ruled universe. Here, then, is a man such as the rationalists postulate, one who rejected the guidance of an infallible Church, and depended on his reason alone, one who, nevertheless, found that that reason applied to natural phenomena led him to reject as well the foolish theory of a self-caused or endless universe, and to accept as an intellectual necessity the existence of a Creator. Great as Lord Kelvin's services are to scientific and social progress, it may be questioned whether his support of Christianity will not in the long run be of greater benefit to the race.

BERNARD J. WHITESIDE.

The Jubilee of the Catholic Needlework Guild.

A BEGINNING IN CATHOLIC SOCIAL WORK.

THE Catholic laity are constantly being urged to take their share in Catholic Social Work. At annual conferences, in the press, in the magazines, and by means of public appeal, the crying need for social workers is explained, the example of non-Catholic effort is pointed to, and the special claim for Catholic service, in that the Catholic body, especially in the larger towns, includes an undue proportion of the poorest class, is repeatedly brought prominently before Catholic public notice.

An initial difficulty in connection with Catholic Social Work, however, seems generally to be overlooked.¹ Every student of the facts must be greatly impressed by the cogent reasons advanced for the necessity of personal service; but Catholic writers upon this important point, strangely enough, seldom afford any guidance to the aspiring social worker as to the best means of making a beginning. A Catholic layman who reads a telling appeal for active workers may be moved thereby with a keen desire to respond. What can he do? He may know nothing about social work, and consequently cannot express an opinion as to whether his capabilities lie in that direction or not. He may be residing in a district in which no organized form of Catholic Social Work exists, and, not unreasonably, he hesitates through his own inexperience to approach the local ecclesiastical authorities upon the matter. For Catholic men, it is true, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul provides a useful field for a beginner, but local conferences flourish in a very small number of missions, and in some cases their work is little known outside the actual persons concerned. Similarly for Catholic women, living in London, there are several settlements, where practical experience of work in the

¹ The writer is not unaware of the existence and objects of the Catholic Social Guild recently established; its influence, however, has not yet had time to make itself widely felt.

482 *The Jubilee of the Catholic Needlework Guild.*

poorest districts, of a length of time as short or as long as the aspiring worker wishes, can be obtained. Such a method of gaining experience, however, cannot fall within reach of many who might nevertheless develop into useful social workers.

The difficulty as to Catholic women will no doubt be solved, as the Catholic Women's League extends its sphere of influence, and succeeds in establishing more local branches in different parts of the country. Meanwhile, it occurs to the writer that it may not be amiss to direct the attention of Catholic women to an organization, which is not nearly so well-known as it deserves to be, which for more than twenty years has been carrying on social work of a very useful and practical character, in which every Catholic woman in the country, no matter what her position in life may be, can easily participate, and which affords her, if she has not yet made a beginning in social work, an opportunity of doing so at a minimum of trouble to herself. This organization is the Catholic Needlework Guild.

Founded in 1885, mainly owing to the inspiration of Mr. James Britten, K.S.G., Hon. Secretary of the Catholic Truth Society, an article from whose pen upon the organization appeared in *THE MONTH* as long ago as August, 1889, the Guild has for object the provision of useful garments for the Catholic poor. It has two classes of supporters: members who undertake each to supply annually at least two garments; and associates who promise each to contribute at least sixpence a year towards the expenses of the Guild. The organization has spread over the country by means of diocesan divisions, which in turn have endeavoured to establish a local branch in every mission district in their respective areas. The methods of organization are of the simplest kind. A diocesan division has its president, vice-president, honorary secretary, and treasurer. Each mission branch has but one officer, a local honorary secretary, whose duties are to secure members and associates to collect their gifts each year, and to forward them in bulk annually at the recognized time to the diocesan depot, fixed by the divisional officers.

The local branch secretaries with the diocesan officers form the governing body for a diocesan division, which meets annually to receive, classify, and distribute the garments sent in by the branches. The garments are allotted amongst the poorer missions and charitable institutions of the diocese according to the necessities of each. In this way, it will be noted, the

wealthy district, from which a larger number of gifts of clothing is expected, comes to the assistance of the poorer mission. As it is customary for the diocesan divisions to hold their annual meetings at or about the beginning of November, the work of the Catholic Needlework Guild has for result that a large number of the poorest parishes in this country receive at the beginning of each winter a gift of useful clothing for the benefit of their necessitous Catholic poor. Only those familiar with social work amongst our poor in the larger towns can realize the incalculable advantage accruing from the existence of the Guild. It is much to be regretted that this charitable undertaking does not receive greater support from Catholic women generally, for those experienced in its working will tell how, despite the generous gifts of members, it is impossible to meet adequately the pressing appeals for assistance which are received each year from the poorer missions all over the country.

The officers of the diocesan divisions constitute the general council for the whole country, which receives from each division a contribution both in money and kind. The general council issues an annual report, embodying the general returns from all the dioceses. The following figures extracted from last year's report, indicate the present position of the Guild throughout the country :

<i>Diocese</i>	No. of Local Branches	No. of Members	No. of Associates	No. of Garments
WESTMINSTER	58	1,610	279	4,777
BIRMINGHAM	38	898	127	1,865
CLIFTON	23	496	174	1,247
HEXHAM AND NEWCASTLE	—	424	174	1,197
LEEDS AND MIDDLESBROUGH	64	1,126	359	2,659
LIVERPOOL	26	566	90	1,184
NEWPORT AND MENEVIA	25	512	229	1,490
NOTTINGHAM	14	365	28	625
NORTHAMPTON	10	96	12	311
PLYMOUTH	25	502	104	1,215
PORTSMOUTH	24	535	88	1,372
SALFORD	16	268	36	702
SOUTHWARK	113	3,505	692	11,400
Total	436	10,903	2,392	30,044

Some of the corresponding totals¹ in previous years, as far as they are available, may be quoted by way of comparison :

¹ Taken from Mr. Britten's article, *THE MONTH*, August, 1889.

484 *The Jubilee of the Catholic Needlework Guild.*

	Branches	Members	Associates	Garments
1885	—	579	—	1,110
1888	96	2,569	144	—
1889	165	4,601	569	—

These figures testify to the solid progress made by the Guild during the past twenty-four years, but at the same time they clearly prove that the majority of Catholic women who could easily assist in this useful work take no part whatever therein. According to last year's *Catholic Directory*, the Catholic population of Great Britain is 2,190,000, of whom probably by far the greater number reside in England and Wales. There must, therefore, be considerably more than 10,903 Catholic women who could easily contribute the small number of garments required from a member of the Guild. Again, the same authority gives the number of churches, chapels, and stations in England and Wales as 1,753, which would seem to denote that the Guild has yet to find a home in many missions.

From the figures quoted above, it will be noticed that one diocesan division easily heads the list. This division of the organization of which the writer has some knowledge, owes its position to the energy, perseverance, and systematic methods of its chief officers, one of whom by dint of personal consultation with the rectors of missions in which the Guild had not been established, has succeeded in securing its foundation in a good number of them. A healthy spirit of emulation has also arisen amongst the larger mission districts within the diocese, with the result that some can point to returns comparable with those of other dioceses. This, of course, is due to the untiring efforts of the local branch secretaries, who spare no trouble to enlist every likely Catholic woman in their districts as members. Notices from the pulpit, printed forms of reminder, postcards, personal calls, are all tried by different secretaries, who, again, with the co-operation of the priest, secure a public notice from the pulpit of the result of the year's work compared with the last annual return. Furthermore, some of the more energetic local officers, after they have collected the garments from their members before transmitting them to the diocesan depot arrange for an exhibition of the articles at their own residences, to which all local members are invited—a method which proves an excellent means of quickening interest in the work.

The annual meeting of the division mentioned above always excites considerable interest within the diocese. The local branches forward their collections of garments some days before the date fixed for it to Bishop's House, where the meeting is held. On the day preceding the meeting, the President, assisted by many willing workers from amongst the local secretaries and friends, spends several hours in sorting out the garments into different sections and arranging them for inspection at the meeting, the garments being stacked in piles according to their species, if such a term may be used, around the meeting-room. As can be imagined, thousands of articles of clothing, arranged in this style, make a very brave show, and do not fail to excite the admiration of, and help to stimulate a greater interest in all those present at the annual meeting, at which the scheme for their distribution is decided upon. The following day is devoted to the partition of the garments into lots for distribution. This proves to be a much more difficult task than many would imagine. Missions requiring grants have to make their applications several weeks previously on a prescribed form, stating for what class of person the garments are wanted, and what particular kind of garment is desired. To allocate the garments accordingly necessitates a good deal of organized work. Last year the diocesan division referred to issued more than 120 parcels to different missions or institutions.

There are many reasons why a special effort for the extension of the Guild should commend itself to all Catholic women during the present year, only two of which need here be mentioned. During the present year, the Guild is celebrating its Silver Jubilee. Many of those interested in its welfare have suggested that the best form of celebrating so important a period in its history would be by securing a large increase both in the number of members and in the number of garments provided. In the last Annual Report, it appears that more than 30,000 garments were received. Some of the more enthusiastic workers have even dared to hint that 50,000 would be a more fitting number for the Jubilee year. The second reason applies to London. The good work achieved by the Guild has perhaps been most appreciated in some of the poorest districts in the Metropolis, in which the largest Catholic elementary schools are situated. The regular gift of clothing each year has proved a great boon to the poor children. During the past year, in connection with each school, owing to the action

of the London County Council, a Children's Care Committee has been formed to consider and deal with the wants of the necessitous children in attendance. The result will be that as these committees develop their work the applications for help in the form of children's garments is certain to become much greater than before. Hence the necessity for an increase both in the number of members and of garments provided by the Guild.

No Catholic woman need be at a loss to find a way of joining the Guild. If no branch exists in her particular district, the diocesan hon. secretary will gladly receive the gifts offered. Moreover, the duties of a local branch hon. secretary are not very onerous, and it should not prove a difficult task for a Catholic woman, even with little leisure, with the co-operation of the local priest and of the diocesan officers, to form a local branch in her district.

In case an aspirant worker does not know the address of her diocesan secretary, it may be well to add that the hon. secretary of the General Council of the Guild is Miss H. Saunders, 162, Elm Park Mansions, Chelsea, S.W., from whom information on that point can be obtained.

JOHN W. GILBERT.

The Scottish Gaels and the "Reformation."

II.

THE period of the "Reformation" settlement was, then, an epoch of quite exceptional inactivity—even of political stagnation—so far as the Scottish Gael was concerned. It does not appear to have entered into the political calculations of the Queen Regent and her advisers that something might be done to stem the rising tide of Protestantism by means of raising the "Highlands" in behalf of the ancient religion and the national cause. The Queen Regent herself was scarcely in a position to inaugurate such a policy, and it may be doubted if her knowledge of the country was extensive enough to enable her to rise superior to the old Stuart prejudice against the clans and their leaders; but some at least of her advisers were men to whom the possibilities of Gaelic Scotland in this direction ought to have occurred, more especially in view of the desperate straits to which the Catholic cause had been reduced. In all the bewildering mass of State documents dealing with the period presently under discussion, there is, however, little, if any, evidence to show that those in authority in Scotland at that time were in the least degree sensible of the martial possibilities of the "Highlands," or were capable of realizing to what good purpose Scottish prowess might be put, in resolute hands, as a means of purging the country of Saxon influences in Church and State. Here and there, indeed, there is a hint or suggestion to the effect that the clans might be trusted to oppose Protestantism, to which they were notoriously ill disposed; but no evidence exists, so far as I am aware, which can be regarded as in the least degree confirmatory of any settled plan or design of raising the clans in behalf of the ancient religion and the national cause. I have seen a letter from a gentleman in Ireland who wrote to one of the Queen Regent's advisers counselling the employment of a mixed body of Irish and Scottish Gaels to put down Protestantism in Scotland; but

this advice, even if it ever reached the hands of those for whom it was intended, was certainly not acted on, nor, apparently, were any steps taken to ascertain how far practicable it might be. The Queen Regent seems to have set on foot some tentative negotiations with a view to engaging the assistance of the then uncrowned Lord of the Isles; but nothing definite came of these preliminaries, which, after a time, were either abruptly dropped or were suffered to die a lingering death. The fact seems to be that the old Stuart prejudice against the clans—the result of the great struggle between the Lords of the Isles and the occupants of the high throne of Scotland—was still so much a vital force in Scottish politics as to preclude any idea of co-operation between "Highlands" and "Lowlands," even with a view to expelling a common enemy. The Stuart attitude towards Gaelic Scotland was one of active suspicion and distrust, if not of downright hostility; and it must be allowed that the Gaelic chiefs had done not a little, apart altogether from the regal pretensions indulged in by their head (MacDonald of the Isles), to foment and aggravate that feeling of hostility and suspicion. It should be remembered that a former Lord of the Isles had conducted negotiations and signed a formal treaty or league of offence and defence with a foreign power (Edward IV. of England) on an independent basis; whilst the frequent harryings, and burnings, and slayings of "Lowland" subjects and territory by roving Gaelic bands had done much to exacerbate contemporary feeling between the two nations inhabiting Scotland. No doubt, a ruler of exceptional parts (which the Queen Regent emphatically was not) would have risen superior to these inauspicious political conditions, and, ignoring on the one hand the exploded pretensions of the MacDonalds and the long train of injuries to which they gave rise, and on the other the many cruel and barbarous enactments directed against the "Highlands" which disgraced the "Lowland" Scottish Statute Book, would have united the nation in a common endeavour to save religion and nationalism to Scotland. It has been made matter of complaint that the Stuart family resembled the Bourbon, inasmuch as they were impervious to the lessons of experience; but this much at all events can be said in behalf of the later Stuarts—namely, that, reversing the policy of their ancestors, they came to learn to trust in the very people against whom their ancestors had directed their cruellest enactments, and that it was by their

means and help that they nearly succeeded in recovering the throne of their ancestors. The pity is, however, that as a family they learned their lesson too late. Prince Charles Edward, with a handful of Gaels behind him, was once within an ace of driving his enemy from the throne. If the Queen Regent or her successor, Mary, had conducted a somewhat similar crusade, the balance of probability is in favour of the theory that their effort would have been entirely successful. Prince Charlie, when he landed in Scotland, found a weakened and greatly divided *Gàidhealtachd*: when the "Reformation" settlement was being engineered in Scotland, Gaeldom was strong and united. An army of twenty or thirty thousand men could easily have been raised in the "Highlands" for service against the associated Lords, and that they were not raised, nor any attempt made to set the fighting clans in motion for so just and proper an object, shows how painfully lacking in initiative and resource were the political measures embraced by the Queen Regent with a view to preserving Catholicity in Scotland and defeating the Anglicizing tendencies of the Protestant party.

When the Regent died, and Mary returned to Scotland, the young Queen found the *Gàidhealtachd* in much the same state as that in which it had been during her guardian's tenure of the royal power. The calm which had succeeded the storm occasioned by the wars between the Stuart kings and the MacDonalds now, however, showed signs of giving place to a revival of inter-tribal strife, and, generally, to a return to those lawless conditions which were the direct result of the struggle between the feudal and Celtic systems within the "Highland" area. Probably, Queen Mary knew little or nothing about the *Gàidhealtachd* when she returned to Scotland to assume the government of her kingdom. She was the product just as much as she was, in a sense, the sport of the French Alliance, and inasmuch as that Alliance was closely identified with the Renaissance, it is scarcely to be wondered at if Mary was ignorant—if to her and to her political advisers, and pastors, and masters the *Gàidhealtachd* was but semi-conquered territory, inhabited by a race of men whose language, as whose manners, were barbarous. It is true that part of her infancy had been spent in that country, and she was destined to visit it on hunting expeditions on yet future occasions; but, unlike some of her royal descendants, Mary, throughout her life, never manifested the slightest interest in her Gaelic subjects, nor does

she appear ever to have realized what an appeal to them in her hour of need and distress might have effected, as well for her personal service as for the cause of religion and country. No doubt her education and training were largely responsible for this singular want of clearness of political vision, and to that extent, at all events, are we justified in regarding her as the innocent victim of circumstances; but, on the other hand, to conciliate the *Gàidhealtachd* was so obviously a point in her game, when she found that the "Lowlands" were no longer to be relied on, that one cannot help thinking that Mary, though by no means positively stupid, yet was not above the average of her sex where sustained and deep thinking are required. The Pope, at all events, who should have been in a position to judge, was of opinion that Mary's frailties and misfortunes were largely the consequence of her sex, and, in otherwise speaking in complimentary terms as to the same Queen's intellectual endowments, one of her latest and most scholarly critics has declared that Mary was "no stateswoman." In this respect, she certainly was no match for her rival, Queen Elizabeth, nor is she to be compared with Isabella of Spain—a really great Queen: otherwise she had never committed the fatal mistake of rushing into her enemy's arms after the battle of Langside. Even so mediocre a politician as Charles I. bethought him of the "Highlands" in his hour of extremity; and that Mary should have fled the country without making, apparently, the slightest effort to engage the services of those who best could serve her, and who, almost to a man, were devoted to the Catholic cause, and who would gladly have risked their lives in support of the Faith and the Crown, proves conclusively that not only was she no stateswoman, but that even what of common-sense and ordinary foresight she possessed could not be trusted to sustain her, when the victim of panic and that headlong impulsiveness to which women of her temperament are peculiarly prone. What would be said of a general who should incontinently deliver up the fortress he has been charged to defend at all costs without calling upon his reserves to play their part in resisting the siege? Surrender is scarcely to be excused, even when the ranks of the defenders are decimated by disease and the enemy's bullets, and when resources in victuals and men have been reduced to their lowest limits; but Mary turned her back on her country, and, by rushing into the arms of Elizabeth, whom she had oft-times provoked and insulted with all a

woman's boundless fertility of invention, performed one of the maddest and most foolish actions recorded in history, without striking so much as a blow with the weapon which alone was capable of silencing the enemy, and without addressing so much as a single appeal to that large and powerful section of her subjects—the Scottish Gaels—who wanted but the word in order to rise and follow her, if needs were, even to the death itself. At the head of a large and powerful army, as it were, devoted to his cause and burning to be led to the attack, the general suddenly clapped spurs to his horse and incontinently fled to the enemy—the victim of unthinking panic and that sort of confused and *jéjune* reasoning than which there is nothing more stultifying to the individual or injurious to the cause he supports. Scotland was lost to the Church through a double misfortune. There was, first of all, the unhappy accident of Mary's existence—no woman was required in Scotland as Queen at such an hour, much less a woman of Mary's unstable character and temperament and slender political attainments; and, in the second place, there was the Queen's own crowning folly in abandoning her country at the very moment when duty and interest alike demanded that she should seriously address herself to the task of utilizing its armed resources. Proper education, joined to a serious attempt to grapple with the undoubted difficulties of her position, might have done something to mitigate the untimely severity of the blow which fell on Scotland when Mary was born; but with regard to the second, it is difficult to understand how this additional misfortune could have been avoided; for it would appear almost to have been decreed that Scotland should be lost to Catholicism through a woman. The psychology of those who are responsible, humanly speaking, for what are called "lost causes" is an interesting subject of discussion; and it will generally be found, I imagine, that just as causes destined to be successful generate, as it were, their own proper and sufficient captains, so, on the other hand, do those condemned to failure by the inscrutable verdict of Providence automatically produce leaders whose mental and moral qualities but precipitate the catastrophe they seek to avert. Mary was obviously the instrument devised by Providence to chastise a country for its sins.

I have already said that the Queen's acquaintance with the *Gàidhealtachd* was but slight. As a child she had passed a few

troubled weeks in a castle on one of the islands in Loch Lomond; but as soon as she returned to Scotland from her long sojourn in France, it was at Edinburgh, the ancient capital of Saxonia or the Lothians, that she fixed her Court. Her various tours throughout her dominions are all on record; but she does not appear to have penetrated far into Gaelic-speaking Scotland, save on one or two occasions. The young Queen was fond of sport, and this seems to have induced her to follow the practice of some of her Stuart predecessors, whose love of venery was equally pronounced, and who were accustomed to repair to the high-lands to hunt as often as the spirit so moved them, and the political state of the country admitted of their leaving the capital. I say advisedly that "Mary does not appear to have penetrated far into the *Gàidhealtachd* save on one or two occasions," inasmuch as in those days Gaelic-speaking Scotland—a term which equates with *Gàidhealtachd*—comprised a far larger area of territory than it does at the present time. For instance, there was no language save Gaelic spoken in Stirling in Mary's day. Places as near to Edinburgh as Alloa—to which she often went—were entirely Gaelic-speaking, and though north of the Forth, or Scots Water, as it used to be called, the English language was fairly prevalent, in Fife and along the eastern sea-board generally, yet the Saxon Fringe did not then extend far inland. The bases of the Grampians, from Aberdeen southwards, and the broad lands in their immediate vicinity were still occupied by a Gaelic-speaking people; and had it not been for Saxonia or the Lothians—the real cradle of the Scottish "Reformation," because English-speaking—it is difficult to see how the "Reformed" tenets had gained lasting foothold in Scotland at all. Nor was the composition of the Court and aristocracy generally less nationalist in character, if we except the descendants of the feudal nobility which had been planted in Scotland as early as the time of David I., and who, though powerful, yet were in a minority. We have it on record that James IV.—by far the best of the Stuart kings—was acquainted with the language of the vast majority of his subjects; and it is only reasonable to suppose that his successor on the Scottish throne was equally conversant with the national tongue. Mary, however, seems to have known no Gaelic, though in most of the great houses, such as Alloa, &c., which she was accustomed to visit, the language of Ossian was still the common speech of the household, which is proved by

the fact that in these great families, whose seats were mostly situated in the low country, Gaelic bards and minstrels were as much a fixed feature of the household establishment as ushers, preceptors, and other retainers. As soon, therefore, as Mary left the Lothians and its capital behind her, in the course of her various peregrinations, she must soon have passed into a Gaelic "atmosphere;" and if she knew no Gaelic, it cannot have been on account of the few opportunities she enjoyed of hearing it spoken by those around her.

In Mary's day, and even for many years after her death, the *Gàidhealtachd* was roughly divisible into two parts, "the Clans" and the Gaelic-speaking people who had come under the influence of the feudal system. "The Clans" comprised, roughly, the tribal members of the Macdonald Confederacy, and represented those Gaels dwelling, for the most part, in the Western Islands, and remoter high-lands, who had not accepted feudal law. The expression in question—"the Clans"—occurs in contemporary writings as late as the rising of 1745, and though at that period it had fallen into considerable disuse, yet in the previous rising (1715) the tribal organization to which it was applied would appear to have been still strong and flourishing. The Gaelic-speaking people, on the other hand, who had accepted feudalism, or rather on whom it had been forced whether they approved it or not, were at this period, and had been for many years previously, grouped together under the leadership of great *territorial* magnates like Argyll, Mar, Lennox, &c., who held their lands of the Crown, and who, though the lineal descendants of ancient Gaelic families, yet were, in one sense, purely feudal nobles. Of these two bodies, the feudalized Gaels were the weaker, not indeed numerically, for they were certainly in the majority, but by reason of the fact that their leaders were attached to the centre of feudalism in Scotland—the Court—by the strongest ties imaginable, the ties by which they held their lands of the Crown. Still, allowing for the peculiar position in which the feudalized nobility was placed, it is evident that an united *Gàidhealtachd* would have proved more than a match for the forces of Protestantism in Scotland had the Queen so willed it, or had the times produced a Catholic statesman capable of repairing Mary's deficiencies and shortcomings as hereditary ruler of the country. It should be remembered that the "Reformation" in Scotland took its rise in the English-speaking towns and

districts, and that the hireling mobs which ravaged the eastern seaboard, burning cathedrals and plundering monasteries wherever they went, were composed, for the most part, of the Anglicized scum of a few big cities. It was unfortunate for Scotland that "the Clans" were never called on to repel the noxious invader—Gaelic people are not accustomed to "rise" save when expressly called on to do so, and then only under duly accredited leaders. It was unfortunate for Scotland that the great territorial Gaelic-speaking magnates were bound to the Crown by indissoluble ties, and that, as though that were not sufficient, the bribe of sharing in Church plunder was held out to them as the price of their abstention or of their active participation in the ungodly proceedings of the Reformers; but it was still more unfortunate for Scotland that her Queen at that momentous period of her national existence was the unstable and "feckless" but beautiful and attractive Mary Stuart.

R. ERSKINE.

Study of a Russian Cathedral.

OF all the churches in the Russian Empire, none, perhaps, is so interesting as the Cathedral of St. Sophia at Kiev. As we gaze up at its glittering cupolas, or walk along its shadowy aisles, we seem to stand face to face with some of the principal actors in the great drama that led to the Christianization of Russia, while at the same time our thoughts are carried back to Byzantium, and above all to its art, which has exercised so potent an influence upon the painters and architects of Western Europe. We have, too, the pleasing sense that we are surveying an edifice which, in spite of its beauty and attractiveness, is comparatively unknown in England, and if the occasion of our visit is in the course of a first journey across the unending Russian plain, we are thrilled with the same joyous sensation that Columbus must have felt when for the first time he sighted land, and guessed that he was about to set his foot upon the threshold of a long-sought continent. Nor does the Cathedral of St. Sophia disappoint the humble student, or send him away without a message; and he who begins by loving her for the changeful beauty of her walls and domes will end by realizing that she was the mistress who initiated him into the origins of Russian art and history.

Kiev, as everybody knows, is one of the largest of Russian cities. It stands on the right bank of the Dnieper, the river by which in early times the Slav might reach the Black Sea and Constantinople, and it is to this fact that it owes its early civilization. The "Old Town" occupies the summit of a range of precipitous cliffs that are washed by the waters of the river, and among its many public offices and churches no building is more conspicuous than the Cathedral of St. Sophia.

Girt with a white wall to hide it from the profane gaze of the citizens, it stands at one end of a spacious square, and is reached by means of a passage that is tunnelled under a campanile erected by Mazeppa.

The campanile is crowned with a gilded cupola ; its bluish-white surface is diversified with classic pilasters, and in an upper storey there is visible an enormous bell, which on solemn occasions gives forth a deep and booming sound to call the Orthodox to prayer. In the passage beneath the tower cheap icons are on sale, prayer-books, and piles of Russian rosaries ; beyond there is a court with a well, and still further on a wooden porch, projecting from the wall of the Cathedral, and tenanted by beggars, who clamorously beseech us to give them a *kopek* for the love of God. But we push by, leaving behind the brilliant summer sunshine and find ourselves within the venerable building.

How hushed, how dark it seems ; but as our eyes become accustomed to the gloom we see upon the wall the dim outline of an icon, gay with artificial flowers. We cross what appears to be a succession of aisles with gleaming brass-work at the end of one of them, until we reach the nave. Square, and of no great dimensions, it is separated from the sanctuary by an iconostasis, while all around from wall and pillar there gaze down upon us martyrs, saints, and prophets, venerable in aspect, posed in stately wise, each one of them with a gilded nimbus round his head. The majority of these frescoes, or wall paintings in secco, date from the eleventh century—that is, they are the work of artists whom Jaroslav summoned from Byzantium. Indestructible in their nature, they were restored about 1850 with the greatest possible care, under the personal supervision of the Emperor Nicholas. The prophets are in sheep-skins, and wear long hair ; priests have a stole and chasuble ; deacons hold a censer and a pyx, martyrs a four-branched cross. Down either side the head of many of the saints there is his name in Greek letters ; but this point is more interesting than important, as Slavonic has always been the language of the Russian Church. Where there is no description, the saint can only be recognized by certain signs with which he is always represented according to the regulations of the icon painters of the monastery of Mt. Athos.

As is common in Russian churches, the nave is separated from the sanctuary by a high screen, or iconostasis, in which are placed the principal icons of the church. In this case the iconostasis is of bronze, and in the rococo style, but it is doubtful if it has improved the appearance of the church. No doubt the iconostasis was originally intended to add to the

sanctity of the rites performed within the sanctuary by concealing them, but this result was only obtained by hiding the beautiful mosaics of the apse from those who were within the body of the church. Formerly, where the iconostasis now stands there was only a marble balustrade of no great elevation, and those who came to the Cathedral to worship knelt before the mosaics of the apse, which were lit up by a great number of hanging lamps suspended from the vault. In the seventeenth century, however, an iconostasis was erected there by the orders of the Archbishop Peter Moghila, the indefatigable restorer of the sanctuaries of Kiev, which he found either in ruin or, what perhaps was worse in his eyes, profaned by the intrusion of the Uniats. As for the iconostasis itself, it contains most of the symbolic imagery which is prescribed by the Church—the representation of the Blessed Trinity, the seven doctors of Orthodoxy, and on the right of the central or “royal door” the icon of the Blessed Virgin and her Child. The latter, as so often happens in Russian iconography, is placed not in the arm but in the girdle of the Virgin. It is, accordingly, the real centre of the icon, which represents the Incarnation of the Son of God by the Power and Wisdom of the Father.

The caretaker, dressed in black, and with big sleeves fluttering about his arms, now beckoned us to follow him behind the iconostasis, into the sanctuary where none but men may enter. We were thus in a position to see all the mosaics on the apse. High up, dominating the altar and all the principal part of the interior of the building, there is a colossal figure of the Mother of God, beautifully preserved on a background of gold. She stands on a footstool (*pomost*), richly adorned with precious stones, and such as might have been seen in days of yore at the Imperial receptions at Byzantium. Her shoes are red, the colour being intended to suggest her royal dignity, her hands are raised in prayer, the face is an extended oval, the expression motionless, but entirely exempt from that sombre look, which distinguishes the earliest Byzantine work. Indeed, the true Byzantine conventionalism is only to be seen in the folds of the dress and the exaggerated proportions of the figure. Around her is written in Greek characters, “God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved. May God help her always.” Hence the wall is known among the common people as the “Indestructible Wall,” and appropriately so, for it has survived neglect and the weathering of eight centuries.

A similar representation of the Blessed Virgin, though not so large, may be seen in St. Mark's at Venice, and also in the Church of St. Sophia at Salonika. There is another in the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, but when this edifice was turned into a mosque the figure was covered with white-wash. The existence of a similar mosaic in the famous Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople is not to be wondered at, for it is well known that Jaroslav aimed at making Kiev a worthy rival of the great city on the shores of the Bosphorus; like Constantinople, it was to have its Golden Gate, and its churches in honour of St. Irene, St. George, and St. Sophia. The two great churches, however, of St. Sophia differ considerably. Their shape is not the same, and, again, twelve (originally thirteen) bulbous cupolas form the roof of St. Sophia at Kiev, whereas only one large cupola with a low, rounded outline adorns the Cathedral of Justinian. The Russian church, too, is much smaller than the other, covering, as it does, about 25,000 square feet, or not half the usual area of a Western cathedral of the same class, but to the spectator the interior appears less than it really is, to such an extent has it been subdivided by pillars, by lateral chapels, and by the iconostasis. In the decoration, however, the resemblance is considerable, though the artists, whom Jaroslav invited to Kiev from Byzantium in the eleventh century, were inferior in skill to their predecessors of the sixth.

Below the figure of the Virgin is a mosaic of the Last Supper. Here our Lord, represented twice at either end of an altar, gives the Bread and Wine to the Apostles, who advance towards Him in a devotional attitude, six of them on either side. The idea of rapid, eager movement in the figures is admirably rendered, and from a theological point of view the mosaic is of interest, for it would seem as if the artists in those early times had wished to encourage the members of the Russian Church to receive the Communion in both kinds. It may, however, be remarked that though the laity in Russia are in this respect upon a level with the priest, it is only the latter who is allowed to drink from the chalice, the laity receiving it one after another from a golden spoon. As our Lord gives the Bread, He is represented with one hand beneath the other, as if to preserve the Eucharist from an accident. Underneath the Apostles on this side is written in Greek, "Take, eat, this is My Body," and on the other side in the corresponding place

we find the words, "Drink ye all of this." The lowest row of figures on the apse includes some ancient mosaics of saints, and two figures in oil painted there in the seventeenth century by order of the Archbishop, Peter Moghila.

As we went out the guide stopped us in front of the tomb of Jaroslav, the mighty ruler of Novgorod and Kiev, the conqueror of the Petchenegians, and above all the founder of the Cathedral of St. Sophia. The sarcophagus which appears to correspond in form with contemporary objects of a similar description, is covered by a lid pierced with two square holes, through which bread and oil were put as a symbol of the Resurrection. The sides are carved with rude imagery, conventional foliage, fishes, stars, birds, and crosses, and in the angles of some of these there are the Greek letters, *ΙΣ ΧΡ ΝΙ ΚΑ* (Jesus Christ conquers), and near them, but on the opposite side, *χ φ π*. Some Russian writers appeal passionately to the Cathedral of St. Sophia in order to prove that in early times eight-branched crosses were unknown in Russia, for nowhere in the Cathedral, amid the ancient work, at any rate, is there anything but the four-branched cross, and it would even seem, according to these writers, that Russia owes the eight-branched cross, which is common enough now-a-days, to no less tainted a source than Archbishop Isidore. He, on his way to Florence to attend the Council that was to arrange for the union of the Greek and Latin Churches, saw the eight-branched cross at Venice, and brought it back with him to the Italian workmen who were engaged at Moscow and at Novgorod. Both Greek and Latin crosses are carved upon the sarcophagus of Jaroslav, but these are of the simplest form.

We went up to the gallery, from which the best view may be had of the interior of the building. Here is the icon of St. Nicholas, the oldest picture of this popular Saint that exists in Russia. Style and inscription are Greek. The Saint, who has a white beard, is represented bareheaded, and clothed in a chasuble; the expression of his face is modest and pleasing, (as in the history of iconography, Byzantine rigidity has been reserved rather for the paintings of women than of aged men, and even this has often ceased to be the case, since Italian influence reached the Court of the Czar at Moscow in the seventeenth century). Connoisseurs in iconography believe that this picture dates from the tenth century, that is to say, that it was contemporaneous with Vladimir and the conversion

of Kiev. In any case, two miracles are told in connection with it, and 1092 is the date that is assigned to the earliest of them. The story is as follows. A woman who was in a vessel on the Dnieper accidentally let her child fall into the water. The child disappeared, but on the following day when the verger of St. Sophia entered the Cathedral, he heard an infant crying, and going to the place whence the crying came, he found wrapt in swaddling clothes and in front of the icon of St. Nicholas, the very child that had been drowned on the preceding day. It was at once restored to its parents, who attributed its rescue to the prayers that they had offered to the Saint.

The other story is found in the chronicles of Novgorod. At the beginning of the twelfth century one of the princes of that town, Mstislav Vladimirovitch, happened to be suffering from a severe attack of paralysis. In his distress he prayed to God and to St. Nicholas, whereupon the latter appeared to him in a dream and told him that he would be completely restored to health, if he sent to Kiev for his icon. The prince accordingly despatched an embassy and priests to that city, and they brought back the icon to the shores of Lake Ilmen where Novgorod stands. The prince covered the picture with kisses, and immediately felt so much better that he was able to walk in solemn procession with it to the church, when it was dipped into water and the prince sprinkled therewith, the result being his complete recovery. In his fervent gratitude he built a church at Novgorod, which he named after St. Nicholas, and another church and a monastery on the island in Lake Ilmen, where he had first seen the miraculous icon of the Saint. Nor is this the only wonder-working object in the Cathedral, for on the other side of the gallery there is a little copper cross, Greek in form, set in a silver disc and known as the image of Our Lady of Koupiatitsk, from a figure of the Blessed Virgin, which is engraved upon the cross. This precious treasure was discovered under a tree—not an uncommon thing in Russia—by a little girl in the seventeenth century. Its history shows the honour in which things of this sort are held in Russia. It was originally found near Pinsk, and was then kept in the monastery of Koupiatitsk, but when the Uniats seized the monastery, the cross was carried to Kiev. In 1700, Prince Tchertvertinsky left it a considerable sum of money, and this was spent in purchasing the silver disc. The

various details connected with its history are inscribed upon the cross itself, and a book has been written recording the miracles that are assigned to it.

"How is it," a Russian once asked his companion in the train, "that icons and crosses are so often found hanging on trees in Russia, but never in England and America?"

One of the most curious sights in the Cathedral is a staircase, ornamented with frescoes of profane subjects, the number of frescoes in the building being due, no doubt, to the want of stone in this part of Russia, a want that forced the architect to provide for the covering of broad spaces of brickwork overlaid with whitewash. Here then a hunter attacks a wild boar; another lets loose a panther on a hedgehog; a lion and lioness devour an animal, which bears some resemblance to a horse: two men with bow and lance give chase to a squirrel that is seated on a tree. In another part a king, wearing a diadem, sits in judgment on a man and a woman, who stand before him, or again boxers approach one another with closed fists, or musicians make melody on the flute, while others dance, clashing cymbals, or wave a scarf or clap their hands. Near these last a man in a tunic stands with his back against a pole, which another climbs in order that he may reach a prize that has been placed on the top. There are also a number of fantastic animals, winged lions, griffins, dragons, falcons and a three-legged lamb. To some it has seemed strange that the early Christians in Russia should have degraded their churches with subjects that are profane or mythological, but it is probable that originally the staircase did not communicate with the Cathedral, but was a part of the palace that belonged to Jaroslav. Scarcely any two writers agree as to the exact meaning of these frescoes, but according to Professor Kondakoff, they include scenes from the amphitheatre at Constantinople—and it should be mentioned that one of them represents a charioteer waiting in his chariot behind a gate as if for the race—rendered with an historic realism of detail, such as, perhaps, is not to be found in any other existing monument. Nor does it seem unnatural that the painters who knew of none but Byzantine art, should have endeavoured to depict the life of ancient Byzantium for the benefit of the newly converted citizens of Kiev, who looked to the city on the Bosphorus as the fountain of religion and civilization.

It was with regret that we left the Cathedral of St. Sophia.

Founded by Jaroslav on the battle-field where he defeated the redoubtable Petchenegians, it continued for centuries to be the burial-place of the princes of Kiev, the most powerful potentates in those days north of the Carpathians. But disaster came quick upon it, for not only was it pillaged by Russian chieftains, but the heathen Tartar stripped it bare, and many a long year the Archbishop of Kiev was compelled to reside at Souzdal or at Novgorod. Again and again in the fifteenth century the Crimean Tartars pillaged and burned the Holy City on the Dnieper, and when Macarius the Archbishop dared to approach it he was slain: his incorruptible remains may be seen to-day among the relics of St. Sophia. A little later and the Cathedral passed into the hands of the Uniats, but it was roofless and in ruin: the façade and porch actually collapsed, but a mysterious light shining from the remains of the murdered prelate was taken to mean that the Cathedral would shortly be restored to the Orthodox. In 1632, the King of Poland gave orders for its transference to Peter Moghila, the champion of Orthodoxy in the seventeenth century; and it was he who set about its restoration. Henceforth its career is not marked by any striking vicissitudes. Standing alone in the highest part of Kiev, with twelve gilded cupolas that flash triumphantly against the Little Russian sky, it is an imperishable monument of the piety and taste of Jaroslav, and of the triumph of Christianity. But to the artist it has yet another message. The gilded domes that rise with a sort of Asiatic opulence and splendour over the white walls are a relic of the influence of the Tartars on the Russians; and it seems somewhat paradoxical that there should be no more conspicuous object now-a-days in the land of the conqueror than these swelling cupolas, which, when the time of her visitation was over, Russia did not disdain to borrow from her hated foe.

T. PERCY ARMSTRONG.

The Coming Elections in Belgium.

ON Sunday, May 22, 1910, will take place in Belgium the biennial elections for half of the Lower House. Will the Catholic party come out victorious? or will it lose its already small majority of four, and finally relinquish the power it has held for twenty-five years? These are questions every friend of the cause is asking himself—anxiously or curiously, according as his friendship for the cause is great or little. That of English Catholics must necessarily be great, and it is to satisfy and enlighten this sympathy that the following lines are written.

With this end in view we shall analyze the situation, trying to estimate the forces at work, how they arose, and what may be surmised as to their effect in the coming crisis. And so this paper will include a glimpse at the past, a survey of the present, a guess at the future.

The story of Belgium's existence as a Government naturally falls under three heads, Unionism, Liberalism, Catholicism. Unionism, or the joint ruling by the two chief parties in the State, lasted seventeen years, from the dawn of independence (1830) to 1847. The predominance of the Liberals, with occasional short intervals, endured from the latter date up to 1884, when they were completely routed by the Catholics, who have since held the field.

Shortly before the revolution against Dutch rule broke out unexpectedly in a theatre at Brussels in 1830, and still more unexpectedly succeeded, Catholics and Liberals, equally oppressed by foreign misgovernment, forgot their common differences, and joined forces for the good of the country. During all the anxious years that followed the revolt, when the chief aim was to consolidate independence, this state of affairs continued. But a day came when freedom was assured, and then the Liberal began to remember he was a Liberal, and to cause the Catholic to reflect that he was a Catholic. Unhappily,

that day found the Liberals strong and united, and the Catholics weak and disorganized, though, of course, in a vast majority in the country.

The Liberal Congress of 1846 marks an epoch; thenceforward the counsels of the Voltairean anti-clerical prevailed, and the Catholic Liberal, the Liberal of Montalembert's school, was forced by the voice of conscience over into the Conservative party. From time to time (1855-57 and 1871-78) the latter held office again, but with little opportunity for legislation, so that the Liberal programme was being almost constantly realized during nearly thirty years. With no clear-cut "platform," no political organization, hardly, as far as voting power was concerned, a national existence, the Catholics were in a pitiable condition. To make matters worse, their leaders, Malou at their head, still clung to the cherished ideal of "Unionism" long after that ideal was abandoned by the Liberals. But adversity is an effective, if stern, schoolmaster. The violence of the Liberals against Christian institutions increased with time, and Catholics were forced to fight for even their elementary rights. The "children of light" were taught by their adversaries, and when in 1879 the climax of oppression came, it found the Catholics very different from what they had been twenty years before. Turning aside from the guidance of Malou, they had wisely heeded the advice of a young University Professor—Jean Moeller—and in 1863 was held the first Congress of Mechlin, a date which marks the awakening and organization of the Catholic party.

The press was organized, a number of social works set on foot, and democratic ideals put forth. The political leaders protested, strange to say, but the movement went on, forced by that popular enthusiasm and sense of innate strength which are the gage of success. The impulse was outside the political sphere: it was the application to social conditions of Catholic principles which generated the force that was finally to overcome the persecutor.

It was owing to this new spirit that when in 1879 diplomatic relations were broken off with the Holy See and religion banished from elementary education by the *loi de malheur*, with one accord hundreds of teachers and thousands of pupils marched out of the public schools, and in six months had built 4,000 parochial schools paid for out of Catholic pockets. The Catholic people were aroused, and their heroic resistance organ-

ized and led.¹ The Liberals did not stand the pressure long. They fell inside of five years, and in the new House of Representatives of 158 members, the Catholic party had a clear majority of twenty-two over Liberals and Independents combined.

The Belgium of to-day dates from that time, the Belgium of social and industrial activity. The intolerable strain of the school situation was immediately eased, religion was given its rightful place once more in education, and by 1890 the majority of the schools were Catholic. At this time, also, the country was suffering greatly from the universal disease of un-Christian economic conditions. This the Catholic government speedily recognized, and there opened up an epoch of social legislation. In 1893 came the revision of the Constitution, establishing a moderated universal suffrage²—"proportional representation"—(in 1898 the plural vote was established)—and at the next elections the Socialists became a party to be reckoned with, having thirty-five seats, won mostly from the Liberals. The various phases of the Congo question did not weaken the Government, but the question of military service, though carried, has resulted, as we shall see, in an appreciable loss of strength.

Taking its tenure of office as a whole, it cannot be denied that the Catholic party has deserved exceedingly well of Belgium, which as a result of its administration stands to-day, industrially, among the five greatest countries; socially, a shining example, copied by many and second to none; morally, a worthy exponent of true Christian principles. It may be useful to inquire into the causes of this success.

First on the list we must place its moderation. In coming into office in 1884, M. Beernaert said: "We shall astonish the world by our moderation." He went slowly, remembering that reliance on mere force always provokes reaction sooner or later. Secondly, the blunders and mistakes of the Liberals in trying to force un-Christian legislation on a Christian land had lowered their prestige almost to the point of extinction. The country was longing for a rest after the costly and unnecessary *lutte scolaire*. Again, the memory of many

¹ See "The Battle of the Schools in Belgium: 1879—1884." By Pierre Verhaegen. THE MONTH, 1905, March, April, May.

² Up to this date the franchise was so restricted that there were only 130,000 voters in the whole kingdom.

unjust measures of that sort was alone enough to keep Catholics from degenerating into the political apathy from which they had been roused. But undoubtedly what most contributed to the strength and permanence of the Catholic cause has been its skilful organization and its attention to the social question.

All, friends and foes, agree in stating that the real interior strength of the party is in the support it receives from the supplementary organizations it has built up by its initiative, and fostered by its legislation. By these, its hold on the country has become deep and lasting, and so long as they endure it may defy the stormiest blasts of Liberalism and Socialism. It is interesting to note that these two ideas of legislation and federation were of gradual development. They came into prominence in the three Congresses of Liège (1888—1890), under the impulse of two young men of action, MM. Levie and Helleputte, whose foresight and soundness of view may be judged by the fact that their advice was that insisted on by Leo XIII. in his famous Encyclical "On the Condition of Labour" in 1891.

The idea of association has been worked out in great detail, and has frequently been described.¹ All classes are provided for. We may give an example or two. For the peasants of the country districts has been instituted the *boerenbond*, a savings-bank, a syndicate for material expansion and self-protection, and a means of religious propaganda all in one. For the industrial workmen, social and political in its aim, the *Ligue Démocratique*, run by such democrats as Levie, Verhaegen, and Helleputte, and for the middle class the *Federation of Catholic Circles*, a chain of societies spread over the whole country, and presided over by M. Ch. Woeste. The scheme is perfect, well-planned, almost invulnerable.²

Any one who wishes to become acquainted with the "labyrinth of social works," as even its enemies call it,³ that the party has built up, cannot do better than consult the admirable *Manuel Social* of Father Vermeersch;⁴ the present writer has neither the competence nor the skill to describe them adequately

¹ See, e.g., "The Situation in Belgium," by V. M. Crawford, *THE MONTH*, November, 1907; "The Belgian Patronage System," by F. O'Connor, *THE MONTH*, November, 1909.

² For the principles that presided at their growth, cf. Defourmy, *Les Congrès Catholiques en Belgique*, Louvain, 1909.

³ Wilmotte, *La Belgique, Morale et Politique*, 1904, p. 156.

⁴ *Manuel Social*, A. Vermeersch, S.J., *Uystpruyst*, Louvain. 2 vols. 1909.

in reasonable space. Suffice it to say that the "social sense" is cultivated from the very cradle. In the first classes of the primary school in most cases are taught, along with the catechism, the first practical notions of social economy, and as a concrete lesson the pupil puts his pennies in a savings-bank against the days of his old age. Then there are professional schools, art schools, house-keeping schools, technical and commercial schools, agricultural schools—and everywhere religion goes along with secular education. When the young man leaves school there are for him the co-operative societies, various syndicates, patronages, savings-banks, and guilds. No wonder Socialism has been checked in late years; and who shall despair of the future of Catholicism, even if the political party is defeated in May?

The great means by which all this, originally the outcome of personal energy, has been fostered and developed is legislation, a means still viewed with some suspicion, although so freely used. How far should the State come to the aid of the workman? The idea dates from Liège in 1890. The public power may rightly help private initiative; the State completes the individual. The principle is good, but, as history shows, it may be wrongly applied. In the hands of the Liberals, State interference degenerated into oppression: and worse results may be expected from the Socialists; that is perhaps why many hesitate to enunciate it as a principle, while acting upon it in practice. But this much cannot be denied, that State interventionism, as it is called, in the hands of a group of capable, far-seeing, honest men, is a very powerful instrument for good, as the condition of Belgium to-day amply proves.

The higher guiding principle of all this has been confidence in an educated democracy. The evils that threaten to swamp society have been especially rampant in the working class. Up to 1888, the solution of all these problems was enshrined in one word,—“Liberty.” But unrestricted freedom of contract, hours, and age of labour, &c., only increased the distress. The *laissez-faire* school of Manchester proved a failure, and was supplanted by the system of social legislation for the workman on Christian lines. For this the Catholic party was exceptionally well adapted, not only by the possession of true principles, but also by the fact that they, rather than the Liberals or Socialists, *were* the people. At least half their numbers were recruited from the working class. The Liberals, on the other hand, represent

only the capitalists, whose instinct is to curtail the workman's liberties as much as possible, whilst the Socialists speak mainly for those who have a distorted or even a pagan view of man's life and destiny.

We have mentioned above that the Catholic party works on principles which are true because founded on a right view of human nature, and guaranteed by the divinely-commissioned Church. And this throws light on a situation that is still to a large extent peculiar to the continent, and that operates both for good and for evil. Where religion enters essentially into political views, a man's politics will necessarily take colour from his faith. The line of cleavage between parties becomes very definite, and to political differences, which elsewhere may co-exist with community of faith, is added the deeper division caused by religious convictions. Thus, for instance, Catholicism tends to be identified with one political party, and to share in its fortunes. And hence on the strength of political convictions a man may find himself acting against the bulk of his co-religionists—not a safe or desirable position for a Catholic.

The question of the origin of this situation is an interesting one, and may be thus explained. The Church, properly speaking, has nothing to do with political opinions which do not contravene the divine or natural law, or interfere with her own rightful liberties. Hence—to take the two main divisions of political views—a Catholic, speaking generally, may be either a Conservative or a Liberal. But, unfortunately, in most continental countries Liberalism has become identified with State-absolutism in such a marked degree as to drive all orthodox Catholics almost necessarily into the opposite camp. Hence it is that those who stand, as the Church teaches them, for man's lawful liberties, freedom of association, of education, and of worship according to conscience, are mainly to be found under the banner of conservatism.

How did this situation come about in Belgium? If the priest had kept out of politics, would the Church ever have been attacked? If the Catholics had not legislated professedly as Catholics, would they ever have been attacked as Catholics? Who began the quarrel? We answer—the quarrel began with Lucifer's *Non serviam*: it is the expression, in the political sphere, of the conflict that goes on in each human heart between nature and grace, between God's assertion of authority and man's desire of independence. Legislation on Catholic lines

is bound to refer to the teaching of the Church, and is equally liable to excite the hostility of those who do not believe in the authority of the Church. Those who will have no king but Cæsar are irritated by deference paid to another power, even though mainly in another sphere. Thus, sooner or later, they were bound to find themselves in opposition to Catholics, and as they held office and abused their power for so long after the "unionist" period, it is not surprising that the Catholic opposition became concentrated in one party, the Conservative. Not all at once, however, for at first there were many Catholic Liberals imbued with the progressive ideas of Montalembert, and infusing a salutary spirit into Catholic ideals. But now, the two orders of ideas have become much more defined, and speaking generally, religion and Conservatism coincide, as do anti-clericalism and Liberalism. In proportion as faith in a divine revelation and a supernatural order decays will this tendency reveal itself in other lands as well. "Progress," which involves the alteration or abolition of Christianity, no true Christian can possibly tolerate. But this is what "Progress" means to Continental Liberalism, and hence spring both Liberal oppression and the uncompromising resistance of Catholics.

However, Liberalism in the old sense is no longer an enemy to be feared. Since the passing away of that great triumvirate of Liberalism, Rogier, Frère-Orban, and Bara, this party has fallen on evil days. Not that it makes less noise than formerly, or blusters less, or hates the Church less, but its influence has weakened and its power is crippled. It has never recovered from the *débâcle* of 1884. Yet it once had the seeds of good things in it, for it has seen many changes throughout its history. In the beginning, as we have seen, many Catholics bore arms in its ranks. Then came the Congress of 1846, and the definite adoption of anti-clericalism as a policy. But this did not keep the party united. Some Liberals were content with the "cry" as enough to keep Catholics from the spoils of office, others were more thorough and wished to de-Christianize the masses. Thus even to-day we find the break between *doctrinaires*, led by M. Hymans, and *radicals*, led by M. Janson. The history of the party is a long series of centralizing legislation, intended to secure the predominance of the State in all, and especially over the Church.

Its greatest leader was Frère-Orban. During his tenure of office he struck blows at nearly every liberty in the land, even down to that of anonymous charities. Of course, all this was

in the name of liberty, just as in the days of the French Revolution, and, we may add, just as in France to-day. But Orban lived to see the failure and reversal of his plans, and his "life went out, in 1894, in shadow and sombre regret for a regime that was no more."¹ The downfall begun in 1884 has since been made more complete, for the recent growth of Socialism has been largely at the expense of the Liberals. Representing, as they do, the comfortable *bourgeoisie*, they have failed to produce a social programme. Instead of improving the lot of the people when they could, they spent their strength in fighting the religion of the people, and in pushing to extremes the supremacy of the State.

The second opposition party, the Socialist, differs from the Liberals in everything except their hatred of religion. Union between the two is unnatural and unprincipled, and cannot last beyond the exigencies of the moment. But for the moment it seems stable, for a *bloc* has been organized between them in secret, so that together they will have only one list and thus save many votes that in the proportional system would be lost. The phenomenon which is visible in France has made its appearance here; the *bourgeoisie* has joined with their sworn foes, the Socialists, in order to overthrow, if possible, the one enemy which they hate even more than each other.

But originally these two opponents of Christian ideals were one. The Socialists are but a development of the radical branch of the Liberals: they are those who identified themselves with the supposed interests of the working-man as opposed to the capitalist, and went completely over to the people, embracing the doctrines of Marx, as modified by Bernstein and von Vollmar. This happened about 1886. "Socialism" then meant, however, indiscriminately any movement tending to uplift the workman, as it often means to-day in Anglo-Saxon lands, and it is curious in the light of more recent developments to see Catholics still hesitating in 1890 whether to admit the doctrines of Socialism, so understood, or not.² The air soon cleared, however, and the party that came into Parliament in 1894 was distinctly irreligious. At this period its success was great, for it promised new and alluring prospects to the worker. However, the democratic Catholic movement was soon ready for this new enemy, and Socialism

¹ Wilmotte, *La Belgique, Morale et Politique*, p. 112.

² Jean Corbiau, *Le Congrès de Malines et les Réformes Sociales*. Bruxelles, 1892, *passim*.

was met in a sense with its own weapons. Its ideals of justice and hatred of oppression were shown to be enshrined in the Catholic programme, and the fallaciousness of its purely material progress was exposed. But the snake was scotched, not killed, and the Socialists are still a strong party, finding its support especially in the industrial districts. There, weakening of the faith, forgetfulness of the true value of poverty, the tempting prize of material well-being, the modern craze for pleasure-seeking, have their due and natural effect, and the workman readily joins a party supposed to be devoted to his interests. Few consider how its plan is to be worked out: they are seduced by plausible promises, and they inquire no further. Indeed, "already," says Wilmotte,¹ "the blundering of the Liberals and the exaggerations of the Socialists have thrown thousands over into the Catholic party." They made the mistake, too, in 1894 of showing their whole hand, and the reaction has already set in. Their very leaders, the adroit tactician, Vandervelde, and the almost brutal Anseele, have become rich and tend more and more to be *bourgeois*, as do the upper class of skilled workmen.

Such, then, are the three parties. From what classes are they recruited? The aristocracy and the upper middle class "vote for God."² Then, the country districts are overwhelmingly Catholic. The lower middle class in the cities follows its origin: Catholic, if from the country; if town-dwellers, Liberal. The solid central middle class is Liberal by caste, tradition, and profession, while the city workmen are almost all Socialists, except those whom Catholicism is gradually winning back by the democratic propaganda. Is the land still Catholic at heart? Very often have the Liberals to complain³—and it is a fact—that those who oppose the Church most loudly show themselves in the only functions where faith is manifested, Catholic at heart; they are baptized, send their boys to Catholic colleges, and their girls to convents, marry them before the altar, "and ask, and accept" (when not prevented by the "Lodges," we may add) "the last rites at their death."⁴

These are the combatants in the coming fight. The main lines of the campaign may be readily suggested. There are the open positive issues; and the hidden, often unavowed ones—the latter the real points at stake, all the more influential

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 181.

² Wilmotte, *Op. cit.* p. 5.

³ *Ibid.* p. 184.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 184.

because they are not put forward openly. Thus, though the Liberals talk loudly about obligatory education and compulsory military service,—things not at all essential to the party,—the real one principle and aim they never lose sight of is the predominance of the State over the Church. Not, be it noted, the readjustment of their relations or the reform of their abuses, real or imaginary, but simply the assertion of State independence of the Church, and Church dependence on the State. All leads up to that; their other principles are matters of circumstance and policy. In like manner, the Catholics' first and foremost care is to preserve the rightful liberties of the Church and to save religion from all encroachments of the State in cult or education. Their further programme of social progress, though an integral part of their policy, is secondary to this.

In like manner the Socialist poses openly as the champion of the working-class, whilst in reality his aim is much more radical—the overthrow of private ownership and religious beliefs as obstacles to his ideals. And thus the Socialist party has to be opposed by the Catholics—a policy which is now thoroughly well understood by the latter—on the grounds of its real destructive views, not as advocating the claims of the oppressed. The workman has to be convinced that Socialist remedies are quack remedies, and that his true physician is the Church, *i.e.*, legislation on Christian principles. No mistake is likely to do greater harm to the Catholic cause than to allow it to seem to be identified with wealth or caste or privilege. But, as has been said, the splendid democratic and social activity of the Catholics is fast dissipating all misunderstanding.

The other, the open economic questions, are just what they might be in any other country. Circumstances, policy, and personal character rule their adoption by the party, and they are fought out on party lines.

Two points, however, are likely to have a special bearing on the issue of the election, and a final word on these must be said. These are the military question, which lies behind, and the school question, which lies ahead.

Last year's struggle about conscription was only a phase of the struggle between two opposed views that is not yet over. There are the advocates of compulsory military service and its enemies. The next phase is not likely to come for some years, but the effects of the last persist. By the old system, the army was recruited by drawing lots, with substitution allowed, and

any deficit was supplemented by volunteers. This system was, or was said to be, not a success. Under heavy pressure from the Left, from King Leopold, and some said from outside, the Government in 1909 proposed a new law. One son from every family must serve, no substitution allowed. The latter practice, as unduly favouring wealth, had always been combated by the Socialists as unjust, and the measure had their support. The Liberals were won over by some concessions and the diplomacy of Vandervelde, but the majority of the Right was opposed to the measure. The Bill, however, passed, twenty-five Catholics voting with the Left. This strange situation stirred the Catholic party to its depths. It was the latest outward manifestation of a long-existing dissension between the more conservative Catholics and the Progressives, the "Young Right," strongly democratic and "interventionist." It was this latter group that voted for the measure. What will be the effect of this revelation on the coming election? At one time matters looked serious, but the offended "Old Right" is gradually and generously forgetting its grievances and rallying to the cry of union. Of course the people, who are freely said to be anti-militarist, will not vote for the Left, but the danger lies in two Catholic candidates being presented, and thus splitting the vote, a danger just recently averted in the case of M. Colfs in Brussels.

The importance of the second great issue—the school question—has never been doubted, for the real principle at stake is the preservation of the Faith. It is one aspect of the great question whether society is to remain Christian or not, and all men—Catholics or not—agree with Leo XIII. that the solution of this problem depends first of all on that of the schools. Liberty of education is a necessary complement of liberty of cult. The enemies of religion realize all this, and their ultimate aim is the entire suppression of all Catholic schools. The proof is had from their own mouths, for on February 15th one of them, skilfully provoked to divulge his real sentiments by M. Woeste, cried out: "God has no right in the school!" and another: "The child belongs to the State before he belongs to the Church." The means to their end is the usual insidious fallacy of a "neutral" education, neither for or against religion. For this, they wish first of all to establish the principle of the subjection of the school to the State, and hope to do this by introducing compulsory education; then, this first step taken, there will be no retreat possible, and the way lies clear to all they aim at.

On the question of obligatory education, some difference of opinion exists among the Catholics. Some, led by M. Woeste, object to it strongly, for the reasons just given. Others favour it as the only solution of a situation, by which thousands of children receive no education at all. As for the "neutral" school, all are agreed about it. It is, in theory, more dangerous than the openly irreligious school, because more insidious; and, of course, in practice it simply becomes irreligious. But to make primary education strictly obligatory is to introduce so many other considerations that division of opinion is not surprising. The experiment made in England in 1902 of making all primary schools a charge on the rates has not been so successful that Belgian Catholics are inclined to adopt it without question. Given a Government which respects liberty of conscience, well and good: but State-supported schools, when the State is in practice anti-religious, are so many engines of persecution. And that is why very many think that the present system, unjust, of course, of paying the Government school-tax and supporting the parochial schools as well, is after all the best that can be done under the circumstances. Statistics show that the "free" schools flourish more and more, whilst the State schools decline—and Catholics here may well be content to wait. It is to be hoped, at any rate, that the suggested difference of opinion in this matter will cause no division in the Catholic vote.

Other questions, always more or less "actual," may or may not affect the struggle. Such are the suffrage question and the Flemish question, both kept active because of urgent demands made by the Socialists for universal manhood suffrage, and by the Flemings, admirably united and energetic, for proper recognition of their language. These are still shaping themselves, and have not reached their term.

Such, then, is the situation the Catholic party is facing. It is a critical one if only because a long tenure of power of itself seems to provoke a change. But their safety depends in their preserving their unity. "Old Right" and "Young Right" have too much in common to make dissension other than suicidal. The one incalculable element is the spread of the Socialist vote. Has the Catholic democratic movement got sufficient hold of the industrial classes to make them faithful to religion? The elections of May 22nd will be a partial answer to that question.

J. WILFRID PARSONS.

"Pascua, Rura, Duces."

THE sight of his regular features was a relief after three weeks' contemplation of our boat-load of hacked-out, hewn-out, thumbled-out Australian *têtes-de-pipe*. Albeit there was a predatory look in his hawk-like eyes, which were fixed on me as being a likely pigeon to pluck. "Signore like a guide?" he remarked tentatively. I took no notice.

The immortal bay half encircled me in its spacious crescent. It was nine o'clock on a cool February morning. Blue azure sky above, blue azure blurr of waters below and between, dove-coloured mist, and the stuccoed façade of the great city shimmering like candle flame and burnished copper. On the right rose the cone of Vesuvius, with its double apex silhouetted like a shadow on the sky, and the serrated contour of mountainous Capri in fainter tone showed over Castellamare and Sorrento. On the left, in mid-heaven, St. Elmo and the Convent of San Martino.

"Signore like a guide—all for himself?" he whispered, and I felt several of my tail feathers already missing.

Parties were being formed to pay a flying visit to Pompeii. No, thank you! I had made that experience on my voyage out. Pompeii, worth a scholar's life-long devotion, becomes but a bundle of salacious memories when viewed thus. I remembered the horrid winks and facial contortions of the guide as he segregated the gentlemen from the women-folk to lead them into evil-looking *impasses* and regale them with horripilant testimonies to Pompeian lubricity. No, I would not re-visit Pompeii.

Then I remembered: was it not this sunny environment that had produced the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*?

Illo Virgilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope.

Did not the grave singer of the earth and its works lie buried here somewhere on the hill of Pausilypus? Had not

Petrarch planted a laurel by his tomb, and Sanazzaro craved to be buried near him?

I turned to him of the hawk-like countenance.

"I want a guide," I said, "to take me to the Tomb of Virgil and the tunnel of Posilippo."

He swooped upon me. "I show you everything," he shouted, "I show you everything," as he bundled me down the landing-companion.

I tried to be firm.

"My friend," I said, grappling with him, "I do not wish to see everything. I want only to see the tomb of Virgil—*la tomba di Virgilio—Virgil's Grab—la tombe de Vergile et Posilippo.*"

"I show you Virgilio, I show you Posilippo, I show you everything," he replied, dislodging me and poking me into an empty boat. And we shot out from the liner over the smooth cerulean levels of the harbour, towards those classic shores.

A quarter of an hour after landing I found I had been in two churches I had not wanted to see, and was then standing beneath the dome of a modern imitation of the Pantheon profanely erected to the glory of St. Francis, while an ancient verger discoursed on the millions spent in building the same.

"Look here," I said to my guide on emerging into the street, "how about the tomb of Virgil and Posilippo?"

Then he gave himself away.

"There is nothing to see at Posilippo," he said desperately, adding: "Signore's boat leaves at four, and he has not seen San Martino or the Museum."

I stared at him aghast, then turned majestically to the driver of a passing carriage, drawn by the leanest horse I had ever set eyes on, and commanded:

"Drive me to Posilippo and the Tomb of Virgil."

Nothing daunted, that traitor of a guide clambered on to the box seat and explained my orders, evidently adding comments of his own, for the two turned about and surveyed me mistrustfully, as though they had got hold of someone demented.

We drove through an interminable tram-lined street that might have been the sea front of Blackpool, say, for all the poetry of Naples that it implied, then we ascended the hill of Posilippo, leaving the tram-lines and entering suburbia. Here were large square yellow houses with what purported to be old

women standing at the open doors, but rather resembled animated sacks of water-melons and pumpkins. Ten minutes beyond these depressing purlieus of modern shabbiness, however, the curtain of the ages was drawn asunder as the carriage rested on the slopes where once stood the Villa of Lucullus, and the unaltered outlines of the storied shores of the Bay of Baiae lay mapped out beneath me. There they were, Pozzuoli and Baija, the haunts of the old pleasure-seekers of 2,000 years ago, and the islands of Procida, and Ischia, and Nisida. And the shades of Horace, and Ovid, and Cicero, and Brutus, and Portia floated in the air. And nature on that cool February morning seemed uncertain whether to array herself in hues valued according to a Pompeiian fresco, or to the tone scheme of a Wilson or a Turner.

"Blue isles and snowy mountains wore the purple noon's transparent light."

Those epithets of Shelley's were most exquisitely thought out.

"But," I queried sternly, "my good sirs, where is the tomb of Virgil, and the tunnel of Posilippo?"

I do not understand Italian, but I think my guide ejaculated to the coachman:

"D— the tomb of Virgil, and blow the tunnel of Posilippo," for it was evident he did not know where these things were to be found.

After a short confab. he returned to his old optimistic refrain:

"I show you them, I show you everything," he cried, and they turned the carriage back towards Naples.

Now, we had passed on our way a large Egyptian edifice, evidently modern, which I have since found on consulting Baedeker was the mausoleum of one Baron Schilizzi. It stands on the very crest of the hill some fifty yards back from the road, and is very blatantly imposing.

They drew up in front of it—the two liars—and turning to me, shouted with triumphant satisfaction:

"*La tomba di Virgilio, Signore, la tomba di Virgilio.*"

I faced them with scorn and derision. Something convinced me that this was not the hallowed spot. I hailed a gentlemanly passer-by, who luckily spoke French, and put the case to him. He knew; tomb and tunnel were far back in Naples. He took up the cudgels for me, and guide and driver were glad to whip up the lean horse to get out of hearing of his insulting gibes.

We reached them at last. There at the foot of the great rock quarries yawned the tall arch of the Grotto of Posilippo, through which all the pageantry of classic Roman life once passed, the legions on march, the great man in his *lectica*, the peasant with his mules laden with *outres* of wine or panniers of fruits from up-country farms.

My companions were cowed. To be sure, here was the tunnel, but where was that blessed tomb?

I pointed out to them a blacksmith's shop, with the superscription, *La Tomba di Vergilio*. A side-door in the shop opened on to a stone staircase that ran up the quarry, with others to follow skirting giddy declivities and moss-grown rocks, descending again into a railed-off enclosure, where inscriptions on the wall clamoured *siste viator*, for we were nearing sacred dust. Then came the little square *Columbarium*, like a turret of a mediæval donjon, hanging sheer over the entrance to the tunnel a hundred feet below, and in it a modest tombstone with the epitaph as famous as that other far off in Stratford town:

Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc
Parthenope; cecini pascua rura duces.

I have never seen a human burial-place outside of consecrated ground. Oh, it may not be authentic, but still, somewhere within measurable distance he was buried here. The memory of that solemn voice that chanted the austerity and loveliness of the husbandman's simple life as against the luxury and splendour that dazzled and corrupted his generation, sanctified the spot. I raised my hat, and with a portentous glance, induced my profane companion to do the same. No, it was not the pretentious and inconsequent phantasmagoria of the *Æneid*—which who of us really understands at all?—that this quiet grave recalled to mind. But rather the genius that invested the savage earth with human significance, supplying it with the clean-cut classic ideal to which at happy moments in Italian spring it can sometimes attain, the great life-lover to whom

Speluncae, vivique lacus et frigida Tempe
Mugitusque boum, mollesque sub arbore somni

were of more moment than the *domus alta superbis foribus* that

Mane salutantum totis vomit aedibus undam
Ingentem.

Rightly he lay here among the ivy-covered rocks, worshipper

of the hard, solid earth, which Wordsworth and the moderns have eviscerated and converted into a mere bundle of moods.

My guide meanwhile, much perplexed, was watching my sanctimonious behaviour with a sardonic smile on his rapacious countenance. At last he spoke :

"What gentlemen told you to come to this place?"

I reflected, then answered oracularly :

"I think it was Grocyn and Lynacre and Colet and Erasmus and all who have fought to keep alive the discipline and delight of classic lore."

He was unabashed, but when I continued : "Now, where is the tomb of Sanazzaro?" his jaw fell. Evidently I was a reincarnation of that legion of the Scriptures who dwelt among the tombs and was possessed of numberless devils. He offered instead to take me to places of ill-repute.

On returning to the liner, a lady showed me with pride her purchases, mostly trumpery from Birmingham, for which she had paid ten times the real value. I produced an ivy-leaf, and reckoning up my expenses, told her what it had cost me.

"My goodness!" she answered, "I should want more than that for my money."

Sic transit gloria mundi !

T. H. PRITCHARD.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

Royal and Noble Jesuits.

It is interesting and instructive to observe the kind of evidence which is considered satisfactory by controversialists of a certain stamp, when it is in accordance with their own prepossessions. A notable instance is furnished by the article "Jesuits" contributed by Mr. Walter Walsh to the *Protestant Dictionary* of Wright and Neil. This author, it is needless to say, claims to be a specialist on his subject, for has he not already written concerning "The Jesuits in Great Britain"?

Without attempting a full examination of his present performance,—albeit in various particulars this might well invite remark—we may confine our attention to one,—namely, that dealing with the crypto-Jesuit, the terrible being who is the bugbear of simple-minded Protestants, and to whom they are taught to ascribe the chief iniquities with which the Society is popularly credited.

The state of the question in this regard is thus exhibited by Mr. Walsh :

In studying the operations of the Jesuit Order in the past and in the present, it is important not to fall into the delusion that its workers are confined to the vowed members, whether they be priests or laymen. If these were all, the Order could not have attained to a tithe of the influence which it has exercised so perniciously. The Jesuits have agents who do most of their work for them, while the real wire-pullers often remain in the dark, unseen and unknown to the general public.

In support of this assertion, various particular cases are cited, of which two may here be considered, as purporting to have something in the way of serious evidence on their behalf. The first is that of no less a person than St. Francis Borgia, and of him Mr. Walsh writes :

As Mr. Cartwright proves, in his valuable work, *The Jesuits: Their Constitution and Teaching*, modern Jesuits have themselves acknowledged that a few prominent men have been *secretly* admitted as

members, such as Francis Borgia, the rich Duke of Gandia, who subsequently became General of the Jesuits.

But, in the first place, it must at once strike the reader that it is not a very convincing evidence of crypto-Jesuitry to quote the case of a man who presently became the acknowledged General of the Order, and therefore the most conspicuous Jesuit in the world. Moreover, from the letter of St. Ignatius Loyola to Borgia on the subject, a document of even greater authority than Mr. Cartwright's "valuable work," it is perfectly clear that if Borgia was to be allowed to let a space of time elapse ere his entrance into the Society was made public, this was to be only for a brief interval, and until he should have completed some important affairs. He was to fulfil his duty to his family by arranging for the marriage and settlement of his children, and to see to the completion of works to which he had pledged himself. Until this should be done he was, while holding himself bound by the rules and obligations of religion, to keep his own counsel, and not disclose to the world the resolution he had taken. Within the space of four years, his obligations being satisfied, he was to take his place openly in the ranks of his fellow Jesuits; and in fact he finished his task within three years. It does not appear, therefore, that his story lends much support to that which we heard from Mr. Walsh.

The other secret Jesuit agent whom we shall notice was so illustrious a personage as the Grand Monarque, of whom we are told:

The celebrated Duke of Saint Simon, in his well-known *Memoirs*, affirms that the libertine Louis XIV., King of France, was secretly admitted into the Society of Jesus shortly before his death.

As to this, it cannot be denied that Saint-Simon, an avowed sympathizer with the Jansenists and hater of the Jesuits, whom he would have rejoiced to see expelled from the country, believed that secret agents were employed by the Society, and thought it probable that the Jesuit Father Tellier, the King's Confessor, persuaded the dying monarch to allow himself to be made a Jesuit; and according to stories which the *Memoirs* relate, Louis pronounced the Vows of a Religious before his confessor, who invested him with a scapular designating him as a Jesuit, or at least in some manner gave convincing proof of what had taken place. It remains true, however, that after all this Saint-Simon thus concludes:

Truth, nevertheless, bids me add that I have since carefully enquired of Maréchal [the King's physician] as to the idea that the king took the Jesuit vows, and all the rest that I have related. Maréchal, who was the soul of truth, and no friend of Father Tellier, assured me that he never perceived anything of the sort, and that he was quite assured there was no grain of truth in all that was said on the subject. Père Tellier might of course have been suspicious and on his guard, and Maréchal was not always in the room or by the bedside. I cannot, however, believe, in spite of all, that had there been any truth in the stories, Maréchal should have had no knowledge of them, and not even a suspicion.

This then is how Saint-Simon *affirms* the truth of the said stories.

Even were it otherwise, and did the testimony of Saint-Simon absolutely confirm, instead of discrediting, the gossip which he recounts, this it is evident would avail Mr. Walsh but little. A moribund old man of near eighty would certainly not be an efficient agent for the furtherance of Jesuit designs, and, according even to those who told the tale, their *bête noire* Tellier worked on his penitent, not by urging the good he might do to the Order or the Church, but solely by assuring him of the benefits to be secured for his own soul by this affiliation. In this fashion can history be manipulated even by a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.

J. G.

"Ido," a New International Language.

On Wednesday in Easter week in Paris, under the patronage of the Archbishop, was opened the Catholic International Congress, which lasted four days and a half. Our English Catholic papers were silent about it, which makes us wonder who represented this country there. Non-Catholic sources leave us in some doubt as to its precise character. *The Review of Reviews* mentions it under the heading "Esperanto," and calls it, "The First Congress of the International Catholic Union," presumably of Esperantists. *The Re-Union Magazine*, on the other hand, implies that its object was religious, and that it was remarkable as being the first Catholic International Congress to take "Esperanto" for its business language. However that may be, at two High Masses which were celebrated during the

Congress, hymns were sung in "Esperanto," and the green banner of the movement was solemnly blessed at Montmartre. We see here plain indications that the need of an international language continues to be felt, and that its use, already widespread, is still growing.

But in spite of its popularity, "Esperanto" has lately met a serious rival, all the more serious because, in a sense, a child of its own, and professing to be "Esperanto reformed." We gather an account of its origin and nature from the *Etudes* of March 20th.

It appears that after the Paris Exhibition of 1900, a committee of linguists united to discuss the various international languages then competing for favour.¹ They decided in favour of "Esperanto" subject to certain reforms—a richer vocabulary of roots, more definite rules of derivation (already exceptions had been formed by the uneducated, and had gained ground), easier pronunciation and the abolition of six letters which were not in the Latin alphabet (the originator of the language was a Slav). Unfortunately the Esperantists generally refused to accept these suggested reforms which would have necessitated the reprinting of much of their literature. There was a schism, and the reformers in 1901 appointed a council to carry out their projects. This council has worked energetically for nine years, testing their ideas by experimental publications and trying to perfect their instrument as much as possible. They issue several reviews in "Ido"² and are affiliated with more than 300 other linguistic societies.³ The chief principle underlying their work is that "the best international language is that which affords the greatest facility to the greatest number of learners." Consequently, those roots are chosen which have the maximum of internationality. The author, M. de Beaufront, being a Frenchman has naturally sought for his roots mainly in his own language, but he has managed to select a large number of common ones. It has been calculated by examining 5,379 roots

¹ There have been more than sixty different attempts made to solve the problem of Babel. Of these the ordinary reader probably remembers only "Volapuk" and "Esperanto": the former seems quite dead. Presumably, most of the others are dead too, otherwise, in course of time, we should need a still more universal language to interpret them all.

² "Ido" means "descendant of" and indicates the connection of the new language with "Esperanto."

³ On their side the Esperantists have more than fifty periodicals and institute by annual congresses a vigorous propaganda.

in a lexicon of "Ido," that the chief European languages are represented in the following proportion :¹

91%	of the total are found in	French
83%	" " "	Italian
79%	" " "	English
79%	" " "	Spanish
61%	" " "	German
52%	" " "	Russian.

So that half are absolutely common to all six languages. If "Esperanto" has succeeded so well in spite of its defects, it may be a still greater future is in store for its more logical descendant. It will be interesting to notice whether "Ido" is given any recognition at the British Esperanto Congress to be held at Cheltenham on the 14th, 15th and 16th of this month.

J. K.

"Catholic Socialism."

It is safe to say, and it has often been said, that a great deal of controversy in newspapers and elsewhere would be avoided, if disputants would only define their terms clearly, and adhere to the definitions so framed. The inconvenience, not to say the folly, of not doing so was widely felt during the education controversy, and it is felt to-day in the disputes that rage about a subject which has for the time replaced education as a topic of universal discussion, viz., Socialism. This, in a matter of such moment, is a great misfortune, and all those who love clear thinking should combine to mitigate it as much as possible. For this reason it is very regrettable, seeing that "Socialism" is used to include every variety of social doctrine from the practical application of Christian principles down to the wildest anarchism, that some people should continue to call themselves "Catholic Socialists." Their motive is probably the most admirable: they wish, doubtless, to imply that Catholicism, rightly understood, makes for the social betterment of the race; but the result is only to confuse the issues in the minds of the

¹ Without entering into details of grammar and inflection, we may illustrate the language by the following specimens. The first is a notice to subscribers: the second the "Hail Mary":—

"*Avizo.—L'aboniti, di qui l'abono finas cum ica numero, esas pregata renuviar max balde [Germ. "baldig"] lia abono, por ricevar sen interrompo la sequenta numeri.*"

"*Saluto Maria, gracoplena: kun vu esas la Siniro: vu bendikesas inter omna virini, e bendikesas la fructo di vua sino Jesu.—Santa Maria, patrino di Deo, pregez por ni pekosi, nun ed en la horo di nia morto. Amen.*"

ill-instructed. For, though still ambiguous, the term Socialism has by this time a predominantly evil connotation. In the minds of most of its adherents it covers at least some doctrines which are incompatible with Catholic teaching, and, in the interests of truth and plain dealing, the one word should be kept consistently for the one thing. We are glad to be able to quote in support of this view the words of one who was a life-long opponent of the abuses of wealth and power and privilege—Cardinal Manning. Commenting on the famous Labour Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, of Pope Leo XIII. in 1891, the Cardinal wrote :

The terms Socialism and Socialistic have an essentially ill signification. Socialism is to society what Rationalism is to reasoning. It denotes an abuse, an excess, a de-ordination in human society, as Rationalism denotes a misuse and an abuse of reason. All reasoning must be rational that is in conformity with the laws of reason, and all [sound] legislation for human society must be both human and social by the necessity and nature of mankind. Inhuman and anti-social law is not law, but tyranny or anarchy. It implies, therefore, a laxity of thought, or at least of terminology, to speak of Christian Socialism or of Catholic Socialism.

The first sentence of the above passage is perhaps worded somewhat loosely. There is nothing *essentially* evil in the term Socialism. Prevalent usage *might* have associated it with a kind of social reform which was quite compatible with Christian principles, but as a matter of fact, it has not done so. The word Socialism is now so commonly used to include principles which assume the perfectibility of society without religion, which ignore the relations of this life to the life hereafter, which deny the divine commission of the Church, which attack the natural right of private ownership, which interfere with the constitution of the Christian family, which substitute civic morality and State absolutism for God and the Gospel, that to apply to it the epithet "Catholic" is to associate light with darkness, and Christ with Belial. Let Catholics be foremost, as their faith demands, in rectifying current disorders of every sort, let them recognize all that is good in Socialism—hatred of dishonesty and injustice, regard for the poor and unfortunate, contempt for useless luxury, aspirations after true liberty—and do their best to guide these tendencies to their proper goal, but let them not compromise the good name of the Church by associating it either with wrongful abuse or unrighteous remedy.

J. K.

Haeckelian Philosophy.

The re-publication in a Library Edition of Professor Haeckel's *Evolution of Man*, which first appeared nearly thirty years ago, is introduced by the authorities of the Rationalist Press Association with a blare of trumpets well-calculated to overawe those who may be inclined to doubt whether the great man of Jena has really spoken the last word upon the fundamental mysteries which he professes to have solved. That his work will be taken by many at his own valuation is highly probable, for already we have evidence that it is so taken by critics whose function it is to guide public opinion. Thus we read in the *Daily Telegraph*: "We doubt whether those even who are well acquainted with Darwin's *Origin of Man* [by which apparently the *Descent of Man* is meant] and the main facts of evolution understand clearly the special discovery associated with the famous Jena Professor, or the magnificent theory he has so marvellously grasped and so triumphantly proved." So, too, the *Daily Chronicle*: "If there lives a man who is prepared, after reading these volumes, to question their main thesis, he is to be complimented on his inviolate mind. Neither Fate nor facts can touch him."

What may be the "special discovery" made by Haeckel, or what precisely are the "facts" which should not suffer the reader to keep his mind inviolate, the writers of the above confident paragraphs would not find it easy to particularize,—for nothing is more evident to anyone who studies the Professor's own presentation of his case than that there is hardly anything which even makes a pretence to be scientific. As one of his German critics declares: "Of new evidence there is absolutely nothing; we find the old familiar assumptions repeated again and again with wearisome persistency;" and in lieu of facts we have assertions which depend for their value on the *ipse dixit* of the master. So obvious is this that in his own country the "Prophet of Jena," as he is often styled, does not now find the favour accorded him in England, especially amongst those whose acquaintance with Science and scientific methods is slight; and it is undoubtedly to this class that the Rationalist Press Association chiefly appeals. But amongst scientific experts, whether at home or abroad, it would be vain to seek authorities who countenance the encomiums of our reviewers. As one so eminent and judicial as Professor Driesch explains—It is lawful and convenient to employ certain items

of Haeckel's terminology, "even if one does not agree with most, or perhaps almost all, of his speculations."

J. G.

How Convent-Scandals are Manufactured.

"Escaped nuns," even bogus ones, are comparatively rare, and soon become, so to speak, shop-soiled. On the other hand, the exigences of the anti-Convent agitation, unsupported as it is by any real facts or intelligible theories, demand, in order to replace damaged goods of the above description, a constant succession of startling revelations of the iniquities of the cloister. And so we can imagine the bigots, who make their living by appeals to religious prejudice, being occasionally at a loss to keep up the supply. At any rate, it would seem that a difficulty of this sort has inspired the publication lately in one of the low Protestant monthlies of a legend entitled, "Thrilling Rescue from a Liverpool Convent," a story which we propose to notice, not for the purpose of refuting it, as it would deceive no sane person, whether Catholic or not, but in order to show the unblushing mendacity with which such "sensations" are concocted. Enquiries at the institution in question revealed the following facts, which were used as the groundwork of the subsequent legend. We omit all names as not necessary for our purpose.

A poor Catholic girl, aged fourteen, was received some five years ago, with the consent of her mother, at a Home in Liverpool under charge of certain nuns, at the instance of a lady who promised to find her a situation when she had had two years' training. At the end of that time the girl wrote to her mother, got the letter back marked "undelivered," and so remained on in the Home for another three years. Apparently, she made no further attempt to find her mother, nor did the latter make her address known to her daughter, although the girl continued to correspond with other relatives. However, during Christmas week last year, the mother, who twelve months before had become a Protestant, arrived at the Home from Birmingham, accompanied by another woman and a local preacher, demanded to see her daughter, asked the latter to come away with her—a request at first refused but afterwards acceded to—and proceeded there and then to divest her of the garb worn in the Institution, and clothe her in garments which

she had brought for the purpose. The party then left the Home with the girl and returned to Birmingham.

These are all the relevant incidents, and now let us see something of the process by which they were transformed into a "convent-scandal." The title itself forms a very promising beginning, as it makes or implies five statements, only one of which is true, viz., that Liverpool was the scene of the affair. There was no rescue nor any thrills, because there was no opposition to the girl's removal; the latter was not a nun, and she was taken away, not from a Convent, but from a Home for Working-Girls, approved by the Home Office and under Government Inspection. These facts are conveniently ignored by the Protestant account, which goes on in this strain:

Twelve months ago it pleased the Lord Jesus to remove the scales of Romish darkness and superstition from the mother's eyes, and the thought of her daughter's position in a convent, with the endless round of drudgery, penances, mortifications, and dead ceremonies, tore her heartstrings with rude anguish. Her soul became consumed with desire to see her child once more, to kneel with her at the Saviour's gracious feet, and that she might be delivered from Papal darkness, and rejoice in the glorious light and liberty of the Gospel, &c., &c.

At last, to summarize the unctuous rigmarole, the revelations made about convents by a Birmingham preacher inspired the "frenzied mother" with the hope that he might help her to rescue her child, and ease, incidentally, the strain on her heart-strings: We shall not, we fancy, be rash in concluding that purse-strings had also a good deal to do with their meeting, for the afflicted mother, both before and after her operation for religious cataract, must have known that her daughter was not subjected to convent discipline, and might have been visited or removed any day of the "five long dreary years" that separated them. However, it was determined to have a "rescue," and the party journeyed to Liverpool accordingly. Unfortunately for their scheme, the Sister Superior did not rise to the occasion. In the Protestant account, it is true, she quite comes up to the Hocking standard. We are told that at first they were "courteously received by the lady in question," and mother and daughter were allowed to see each other, unembarrassed by her presence, but when she returned and was informed that the girl was to be taken away immediately, her "demeanour at once underwent a marvellous transformation. Drawing herself to her full height, and striking a dramatic attitude, she pointed with her finger towards the

door, and peremptorily ordered the girl to go to her place in the laundry." After that, "something of the nature of a struggle took place" over the person of the girl, and twice during their progress to the door the Superior tried to restrain them by force. When the front-door was opened "the girl rushed into the street," and the party got clear away and made for the offices of the *Liverpool Courier*, where a full statement of this "thrilling escape" was given in the sub-editor's room. "But, marvellous to relate, in these days of a supposed free press," nothing appeared in that paper, nor in "its evening contemporary, the *Express*."

Catholics need not the assurance that all this is nearly unmitigated mendacity. There was no struggle. The girl was at first unwilling to go with her mother, and the Sister Superior not unnaturally complained that she had received no notice of her intended removal, offering to send the girl next day properly equipped. But, seeing the mother determined to have her way, the Superior contented herself with ordering the preacher out of the room whilst the girl was being reclothed. As for the newspapers, they merely showed a discreet regard for the law of libel, in refusing to publish what was demonstrably false and malicious.¹ For instance, the girl states :

All girls are at work by 6 o'clock in the morning, and cease work at 6 o'clock in the evening. The only break during these long hours is for breakfast at 7.30, half an hour, and for dinner at 12.30, half an hour.

Now, as before implied, the laundry and workshops of this Home are working under the Factory Act, and the hours have been approved by the Home Office. The girls rise at 6 o'clock: have their breakfast before they begin work at 8: dine at 12.30 with an hour for recreation: have afternoon-tea at 3.30 with half an hour for recreation: cease work at 6, when they have supper and recreation: retire at 8.30. The Factory Inspectors visit the Home to see that these hours are observed.

It would seem, then, that the anti-convent scandal-mongers had rather overstepped the mark in this latest effort of fiction, trusting, probably, to escape prosecution for libel, to the natural reluctance of religious women to subject themselves to the notoriety of a public law-suit. They may also, we fancy, ascribe their immunity to their own insignificance. J. K.

¹ "So when Dr. Horton says sternly to the practical sub-Editor, 'You have not had enough anti-Popery revelations in your paper,' the practical sub-Editor laughs and says—'Thank you, we have had *quite* enough.'"—Mr. Chesterton, in the *Daily News*, March 19, 1909.

Natural Theology and an Oxford Professor.

The last book of the complete Bible has generally been the happy hunting ground for those self-commissioned prophets and interpreters who have pushed to its logical conclusion the great Protestant principle of private judgment applied to the Scriptures. Fanatical minds have rioted amongst the gorgeous and terrific imagery of the inspired Apostle, and drawn therefrom various "unauthorized programmes," reflecting their own religious idiosyncracies, of the world's future history. But now it would seem that the Apocalypse has been exhausted, and the zeal of these "prophets" is directed to the other end of the Bible. They have turned from foretelling the future to the more prosaic task of explaining the past. A correspondent has kindly sent us a commentary on Genesis which first appeared two years ago, but which has been reprinted twice this year, and may be found, we believe, on railway bookstalls. It is called *Creation's Dawn*, and it professes to explain all the difficulties of the early history of the world as recorded in Genesis by the simple expedient of postulating two distinct deities, working in harmony and sharing creation between them. Now, as our correspondent remarks, it would hardly be worth while noticing this silly assumption were it not that no less a person than Professor A. H. Sayce, the eminent Assyriologist, writes a sympathetic preface to the book, trusting that "it will find a hearing in the world of letters." Of course there are many in Oxford to whom "daring and originality" make greater appeal than mere truth, but we did not expect that Professor Sayce, who has done such good service in defending the Scriptures against the wilder Higher Critics would lend such folk his countenance in any way. It would seem that devotion to Assyriology had weakened his hold on Natural Theology. Two distinct Gods, forsooth, between whom "there was neither hostility nor opposition"! Why, any Catholic boy in the upper classes of Christian doctrine could inform this Anglican divine, and the absurd writer "Kish" whose work he fathers, that God, the First Cause, being self-existent, is essentially infinite in all perfections, and, as essentially, one. God is one because infinite, and infinite because self-existing. The notion of a finite First Cause is a contradiction in terms, just as is the notion of two infinities. A First Cause which did not contain all possible perfection is inconceivable, for perfection is only possible through having a cause.

We presume that these very elementary metaphysical ideas form some part of the early training of Anglican theologians. It is a pity that they should be forgotten in later life, and that the Rev. A. H. Sayce should lend the weight of his great name to an interpretation of the Bible which requires the existence of two separate Gods, and which, finding the dogma of the Trinity inconvenient, sweeps it away as a thing of "man's invention."

A few words will suffice to give some idea of this new specimen of the variations of Protestantism. The two deities, of course, are the *Elohim* and *Yahveh* of the Higher Critics, distinct and separate Gods "who, in complete unison of purpose and entire harmony, created all that which is contained in the first chapter of Genesis up to the twenty-sixth verse." Then *Elohim* creates a distinct genus of man, male and female, in his own image; these were the pre-Adamites, and merely the highest forms of animal life, without spiritual souls although intelligent (!). Later, *Yahveh* in his turn makes a man in *his* image and breathes into him the "breath of life," which makes him superior to the pre-Adamite, as having in some sort the divine nature. The "corruption" which caused the flood was the union of these two races whom their authors meant to keep distinct. But specimens of the pre-Adamites were taken into the Ark and became the progenitors of the black races who, as the author naïvely remarks, have "no knowledge of right and wrong," but who, if they believe in Christ, will also receive a "living soul" and become immortal. And so on and so forth.

The explanation of many passages in Genesis is undoubtedly difficult. We must be content to remain in ignorance of many things incidentally touched on or imperfectly sketched in the old record. But foolish attempts like this before us which, whilst accounting for some of the discrepancies in the text, raise much more fundamental objections, make us only admire the more the wisdom of the Holy Spirit who forbade Scripture to be of "private interpretation,"¹ and entrusted His written revelation to the guardianship of His infallible Church.

J. K.

¹ 2 St. Peter i. 20.

Reviews.

I.—THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPÆDIA.¹

We must heartily congratulate the editors of the *Catholic Encyclopædia* upon the regularity with which the volumes of that important work have hitherto appeared. It requires but little consideration to appreciate the very exceptional difficulties which must beset the carrying through of an undertaking which employs so large a number of foreign contributors, or at any rate of contributors who live across the seas. In matters of typography and press correction, it seems to us that we detect steady improvement, and the illustrations also remain at a very high level. Moreover, the substance of the work is beyond question of the highest utility to all intelligent priests and laymen who are brought into contact with the religious difficulties of our times. There may be individual articles which perhaps fail to equip the reader with the very latest information and the fullest bibliographical references, but taking it as a whole there is no work which can for a moment be compared with it in utility for the ordinary purposes of a Catholic college or mission library.

The volume before us, the seventh of the fifteen which are to complete the work, extends from *Gregory XII.* to *Infallibility*. It stands out among the instalments hitherto published as a volume of small articles. Subjects like *Hungary* and *India*, *Incarnation* and *Infallibility*, *Holland* and *Immaculate Conception*, necessarily demand a certain degree of fulness of treatment, but we may confess that we have been struck in this, as in previous volumes, by the very capricious apportionment of space among articles of minor interest. For example, one of the very longest contributions in the present instalment is that upon the *Huron Indians*, by Father A. E. Jones, the space given to this subject being nearly three times as great as that devoted to

¹ Vol. VII. London: Caxton Publishing Co. Pp. xvi, 800. Price, 27s. 6d. 1910.

Holland. Why the Huron Indians, whose Catholic history covers three centuries, should be treated as three times more important to the Church at large than the people of Holland, with all their activities during more than a thousand years, is to us a mystery. On the other hand, the article on *Indulgences*, by Father W. H. Kent, of St. Charles', Bayswater, seems to be cut down to the narrowest possible limits. Yet the subject is surely an important one. May we express our surprise, by the way, that in the bibliography to this article no word is said of the numerous publications of Dr. Nicholas Paulus, who has more deeply studied the subject of mediæval Indulgences than any man living? *Per contra*, we find an astonishingly elaborate article on the *Early Christian Hierarchy* by Father Dunin Borkowski, who seems, like Father Jones of the Huron Indians, to have received a blank cheque to write as much as he liked. Let us hasten, however, to add that Father Dunin Borkowski's essay is in itself an original and valuable contribution to early Church history. Another disproportionately long article is that devoted to *History* by Mgr. J. P. Kirsch, also an excellent paper in itself, but like many of the other foreign contributions, weak in its relation to the special needs of readers of English speech. The only considerable article in the volume of scientific bearing, if we except the more or less geographical articles, like the very complete account of Indo-China by Mr. Thomas Kennedy, is that on *Hypnotism* by Dr. Surbled, a not particularly convincing piece of work. But besides those already mentioned there are many notices of a more ecclesiastical character which are full of interest and utility. Father Delehaye, the Bollandist, writes on *Hagiography*, Father J. H. Pollen on *St. Ignatius of Loyola* and on *Gunpowder Plot*, Mr. Fox Davies on *Ecclesiastical Heraldry*, Mr. Edgar Prestage on *Prince Henry the Navigator*, Dom H. Leclercq on *Holy Oils* and *Holy Water*, &c. Some of the minor articles are perhaps not quite satisfactory (we might instance that on St. Ignatius of Antioch), but on the whole the work is well done. We may in conclusion call attention to a fact which we have learnt from a short notice of Mr. J. C. Harris, the creator of Uncle Remus, that this great folk-lore student was the husband of a Catholic Canadian wife, and was himself happily received into the Church a few days before his death.

2.—THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE.¹

This book, the latest of the Stonyhurst Philosophical Series, is of considerable importance. The mere fact of the book being written means that the Aristotelian-Scholastic philosophy which it interprets is taking up a new position in England as it has already done on the Continent. The Stonyhurst manuals, as indeed most of the works of the Louvain neo-scholastic school, have been concerned with restating the great doctrines of Scholasticism. Other systems have been treated as subsidiary and as objections to the scholastic system. As Father Maher points out in the Preface which he contributes to the present book, the time is ripe when Scholasticism, for the sake of its own students and of others, should take a more detailed account of the great rival philosophical theories. This can be done only by monographs on special subjects. The present book treats in particular the problem of knowledge. Its value has been singularly attested by the distinction it won for its author as a Thesis in the very unmediaeval M.A. examination of the University of London.

The author has not attempted to discuss all the theories of knowledge which philosophy has offered. Recognizing in the varieties of these theories three fundamental types, Idealism, Empiricism, and Aristotelian Moderate Realism, he chooses for discussion a modern type of each of the two extremes—the Absolutism of Mr. Bradley, the leading English idealist, and the widely current though ill-defined Pragmatism. These he treats from the triple standpoint presented in the knowledge problem, exposing and criticizing in turn the psychological groundwork of each, its metaphysical teaching or implications, its critical doctrine. To these discussions the author has done well in adding chapters on the relation which each theory bears to scientific methods. Of these methods, inasmuch as they are our sources of organized knowledge of "reality," every philosophy must take account. We would commend the exposition particularly for the free use of quotations from the philosophers under discussion. The author, however, does not confine himself to appreciation or destructive criticism. He passes together the systems into the synthesis of his own teaching, and shows how the points on which they rightly insist

¹ By Leslie J. Walker, S.J., M.A. London: Longmans. Pp. xxxix, 696. Price, 9s. 1910.

are already found in the scholastic system and found in a larger and more harmonious setting.

The treatment of Absolutism opens with an excellent analysis of the data of experience. The author remarks that his conclusions are such as any plain man may arrive at. But patient introspection, though it carries conviction when its results are set forth by another, is rarely made—how rarely is seen in the discussion of the defects of Mr. Bradley's psychology. This accurate analysis is the groundwork of the whole book. The same skill—itself a tribute to the value of scholastic training—is apparent in the handling of Mr. Bradley's philosophy. The unsuspected assumptions, the half-bridged gaps in development which have led to the doctrine of Reality as Sentient Experience are laid bare. The author's long and sustained argument is acutely carried through to a conclusion which sums up the Idealist's ambiguities, his invalid transitions, and the general inconclusiveness of his teaching.

The treatment of Pragmatism is in some ways easier, as it does not directly involve problems so deeply metaphysical. The author shows how psychologically it is invalid because of its amazing generalizations from isolated facts to the whole field of conscious life. He points out the logical inconsistency fundamental to a system which makes intellect subject to purpose and yet can discriminate purposes only by means of intellect. But in the end the metaphysical problem indirectly appears as the real difficulty to Pragmatism. Absolutism is fairly coherent in its metaphysic, but greatly troubled by experience. Pragmatism accepts experience, and generalizing from parts of it without careful introspection, lands itself in a metaphysical quagmire. There its only plea is an unconvincing *tu quoque*: it perishes in as rank a scepticism as any which it was invented to escape.

The difficulties of pragmatic criticism have not been altogether escaped. We could almost write the pragmatic review of the book. Thus the author rightly ignores Dr. Schiller's protest¹ against the metaphysical reading of *Axioms as Postulates*, but it would be well to justify explicitly his refusal to separate ontology and genetic psychology. Again, his reading of the passage in *Studies in Humanism*² will be met by an appeal to James' doctrine of truth-on-trust unless verification is needed.

¹ *Studies in Humanism*, p. 428.

² *Ibid.* p. 430.

Nor does he explain—as he might easily do—why he refuses to regard as “copying” the *immanent* copying which Dr. Schiller allows.¹ Anyone familiar with pragmatic literature knows how, *ignorans elenchum*, the pragmatist will seize such points as these. But the fault lies not as much with the author, as with Pragmatism, which is so protean and elusive. To any attack on it a textual reply can be offered, which uniformly is an acceptance of the opponent’s doctrine, to be followed by an attack on him under cover of the white flag. There are two Pragmatisms, one for polemic, one for reply.

But the most valuable part of the book is the author’s exposition of scholastic epistemology. Here there is much new ground to be broken in constructive work by means of juxtaposition of the scholastic metaphysics and psychology. The mediæval scholastics were not called on to write an epistemology. The author’s exposition is admirable. Terse, clear, not too technical, it will bring light to many who have never known Scholasticism, and to scholastics who have never focussed their knowledge on these particular problems. The author has avoided unnecessary minutiae, and has, moreover, shown that, though details must be readjusted in the light of research, the great metaphysical principles of scholastic epistemology stand and must stand independent of change in physical or physiological discussions. We should have liked to see an exposition of the doctrine of essence and existence with a view to explaining the nature of the intentional union of the soul and the essence, in the cognitional act.

In conclusion we commend the book to all scholastics, to all the growing band of thinkers who look back to Aristotle, and to all who think with Mr. Chesterton that the most important thing about a man is his philosophy. We congratulate the author on his valuable contribution to sound philosophy. The book is in the well-known binding of the Stonyhurst Series. The wealth of material and diversity of topics is made more manageable to the reader by a full Index and a complete Analysis of Contents.

3.—THE CHRISTIAN GOSPEL AND PAGAN SYNCRETISM.²

Those whose philosophical preconceptions exclude the possibility of a transcendent religion are driven to seek for some

¹ Mind, N.S. No. 63, p. 404.

² *Études de Philosophie et de Critique religieuse. L’Évangile en face du Synchrétisme païen.* Paris: Bloud et Cie. Pp. xxi, 202. Price, 3 fr. 1910.

naturalistic explanation of the rise and development of the religion of Jesus Christ. An explanation of this sort now much in favour regards it as the outcome of a syncretism which during the early Christian centuries combined the simple story of the original Gospels with dogmas and rites gathered from the ancient mystic cults of Greece and Asia, together with Neopythagorean and Neo-platonic philosophies—all under a social organization unconsciously copied from that of the Roman Empire. It is to the examination and refutation of this theory that Père Allo devotes his little volume *L'Évangile en face du Syncretisme païen*. That Christianity was born into a world where these spurious religions were in active effervescence, and that many of its converts were drawn from that milieu and were liable to relapse into its ways, is a certain and not a surprising fact. It is true also that these religions like Christianity had for their object to meet the questionings and cravings with reference to the Life beyond, which pagan philosophies could neither suppress nor satisfy. They were unsuccessful endeavours to attain the same purpose which Christianity attained so marvellously. It is true likewise that, as time ran on and Christianity had vindicated its exclusive character, it borrowed some of the harmless elements in their rites and, by adapting them to its own uses and infusing into them its own spirit preserved its converts from temptations to relapse which might otherwise have overcome them. But towards these false worships themselves, and all that was characteristic of them, the attitude of Christianity was one of hostility and aversion, which they in their turn fully reciprocated. The feeling was mutual that their fundamental principles were incompatible and antagonistic. Jesus Christ was a historical person whose character was perfectly real and human, and thus differing altogether from the fantastic creations to which the contemporary pagans ascribed a shadowy divinity. His life was not a series of stupid adventures without relation to any sublime doctrine.

His whole existence, acts and words were confounded with His doctrine: He Himself was His doctrine. His life was His teaching, a teaching which thus became far more striking and penetrating than it could have been had it been given only in simple formulas.

The science of religion consisted wholly in learning to understand this grand, this real, this historical personality.

He, Jesus Christ, was the mystery of God ; in Him did all the treasure of wisdom and knowledge lie hidden ; in Him dwelt all the plenitude of the divinity, for this Man was God Himself, the Creator become Man and visible to men. This Man-God had shown to His brethren that He was God, and by so doing destroyed all pantheistic notions. Man's part was to believe in Him who, though He had allowed Himself to be crucified under Pontius Pilate, showed by His resurrection from the dead that He was the only-begotten of the Father, from whose lips, and not from the speculations of the philosophers, man was to learn a pure doctrine in full harmony with a pure and sublime morality, and based on the most certain facts of the life of a real man. In short, Christianity was a synthesis in unity with itself and in no need to borrow from alien sources doctrines and rites which might to careless eyes seem to bear some resemblance to its own, but were radically diverse from them. Compare for instance the resurrection of Christ with the fabulous resurrections of pagan gods ; the sacred meals for communicating with Dionysos or Mithra with the Christian Eucharist, Christian asceticism with the expiatory self-mutilations of paganism, the *charismata* of early Christian worship with the hysterical and often orgiastic ecstasies of its rivals. Externally there is a resemblance which has no significance, internally how different the two classes of phenomena and how logically the Christian phenomena spring from the ground-principles of that religion !

Such is the argument which Père Allo works out with a grasp of the subject that makes his little book fully worthy of the series in which it appears.

4.—STUDIES IN HILARY OF POITIERS.¹

This is the first of a series of critical studies on various writings attributed to St. Hilary of Poitiers. Father Feder has set himself the task of clearing the way for a subsequent edition of them in the Vienna *Corpus script. eccles. lat.* In the study before us he examines the so-called *fragmenta historica*

¹ Studien zu Hilarius v. Poitiers. I. Die sogenannten "Fragmenta historica" und der sogenannte "Liber I. ad Constantium imperatorem" nach ihrer Überlieferung, inhaltlichen Bedeutung und Entstehung. Von Alfred Feder, S.J. Wien : A. Holder. Pp. 188. 1910.

of St. Hilary, a number of loosely connected documents of great historical importance, and what has hitherto been known as the *Lib. I. ad Constantium*, which is, however, nothing else than one of the *fragmenta* cut loose from the rest at an early time and sent adrift under a misleading title. The documents in question are found to be portions of a great historico-polemical work of the Bishop of Poitiers *adversus Valentem et Ursacium*, a work divided into three books and covering the whole period from the Council of Nicæa, to the year 367. An Appendix gives us a reconstruction of the original, as far as it is extant. Father Feder appears to have established his main points beyond doubt. He has definitely fixed for these puzzling "fragments" their place in the literature of the time, and sufficiently elucidated the many problems connected with them.

In connection with the chief purpose of his inquiry the author leads us into the thick of the Arian controversy, and discusses some of the knottiest problems in the ecclesiastical history of the period. He securely traces his steps through the maze of synods and of numberless and continually changing shades of religious opinion. Being thoroughly well acquainted with contemporary history, he is enabled to interpret as clearly as possible this babel of voices. These chapters are of wider interest. But on specific points he is no less clear, as in his brief but comprehensive account of the Liberius controversy where his acute observations on some aspects of the subject throw, we think, a new light on it. The four disputed letters of the Pope written during his exile, are examined in detail. Whilst strongly declaring in favour of their authenticity, the author sufficiently explains the conduct of Liberius as revealed in these documents. We refer the reader to the second Appendix, where he will find a full vindication of the orthodoxy of this much maligned Pope, and a satisfactory explanation of his want of firmness and consistency in his attitude towards Athanasius. This little book reveals both Father Feder's great scholarship and talent for historical research and his extensive knowledge of his subject, and we are sure the studies which are to follow will be as able and as instructive as the one under review.

5.—THE SCIENCE OF LIFE.¹

"Amidst such varied activity in research and speculation as to the origin, nature, and destiny of life, it would seem to be wise for Christians to decide, from time to time, how far they are called upon to modify or expand their most characteristic hopes and beliefs." It is in these words that the Anglican Bishop of Tasmania states the object he has had in view in the addresses which he combines together in a little volume entitled *The Science of Life and the Larger Hope*. It is a mode of presenting the case not unusual among the present generation of non-Catholic divines, but it generally ends, if not in the practical abandonment of the most fundamental positions of the Christian faith, at all events in the undermining of their only secure foundations. There is much, unfortunately, of this in the present volume, though the intention is good and the spirit worthy of sympathy. In the earlier chapters, on Terrestrial Life, on Mechanical Theories of Life, on Vitalism and Will, there is a great deal which is well put. Such is the determination of the peculiar characteristics of organic as distinguished from inorganic substance, and the exposure of the inadequacy of those mechanical theories of life which are now being generally found out. As against them the author owns himself a disciple of Driesch and Henslow, and holds that it is a force or power over and beyond matter which works in the different forms of life and moulds to their specific requirements the elements which compose their material basis; and he accepts the terms "entelechy" and "directivity" as suitable names for this force, whilst warning us that "he frees it from the ideas and theories that [Aristotle] had connected with it." Perhaps it would have been better for his subsequent argument had he not dismissed these "ideas and theories," but, even as it is, we cannot but rejoice to see a newer generation returning to the principles which previous generations had so contemptuously rejected—for to all intents and purposes, this theory of "entelechy" is the old scholastic doctrine of "matter" and "form," with a word of Greek derivation preferred to its Latin correlative.

When the author proceeds to find feeling in the lowest

¹ *The Science of Life and the Larger Hope*. By the Right Rev. J. E. Mercer, D.D., Bishop of Tasmania. London: Longmans. Pp. 195. Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1910.

organisms, apparently even in those of the vegetable kingdom, and when he finds that feeling implies consciousness, and that this consciousness throughout is accompanied by "will" (the "will to live"), he takes a false step which leads him on to a fatal assertion of continuity between the lower and the human forms of life. He protests that it is vain to isolate man's higher faculties, "inasmuch as they are one and all dependent on organic functions, on food, and on environment"; and yet must acknowledge that "as the months go on the potentialities of the so-called helpless infant begin to manifest themselves, and prove that it is destined to move in a world which the chick can never enter." Is not the difference so vast as to postulate an essential difference in the principle of life within? Had it occurred to the author to make an analysis of the mental act in man, such as the great Catholic philosophers have attempted, he would have seen in what this essential difference consists. Then, too, he would have found what as it is he searches for in vain—a proof, instead of a vague surmise, that man's soul is immortal, as also that those of the lower animals are not.

To pass over the author's attachment to the doctrine of an all-pervading evolution, for which there is, as people are beginning to see, no proof whatever, but which involves him in a strange difficulty from which he does really extricate himself, over our Lord's appearance in the middle instead of at the end of the centuries, let us come to his more strictly theological conclusions. For the doctrine of original sin he can find no place in his system. It is an idea which runs contrary to evolution, and must go, St. Paul notwithstanding—whose utterances on the subject are set down as merely symbolic. The true Fall, to which Genesis refers, is to be interpreted as a "fall upwards." It was the moment when in the upward course of evolution man attained to a sufficiency of moral consciousness to enable him to discriminate right from wrong, and hence began to sin. The Atonement, also, becomes for the author something very different from what St. Paul declared it to be. "We must interpret [the Apostle] in the light of the teaching of his Divine Master," and then we shall find that the true Atonement is that love of God which Jesus Christ implanted in our hearts, and which "leads the child to crush and kill the lower impulses," and so "through repentance and constant upward striving to become more like to the Father . . . who gives Himself so freely for the child's development and welfare."

6.—FOLK-LORE OF THE HOLY LAND.¹

Some of the stories in Mr. Hanauer's *Folk-lore of the Holy Land* may be recognized as old friends, but he wishes it to be understood that "he has derived all of them from the legitimate source of folk-lore, the lips of the people themselves." Where he has noticed a coincidence or similarity with stories otherwise derived, he has pointed it out, but he modestly protests that he is not a skilled folk-lorist, and is prepared to find that there are kinships with his stories of which he has not known. Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall, who writes a short but instructive Introduction, explains that the origin of the stories—that is of the rich raiment of incident and circumstance with which the nucleus of certain or possible fact is clothed—may be gathered for past times by the process of manufacture which may be witnessed going on among the modern fellahin.

Of Old Testament times the fellahin have countless stories, more or less reminiscent of their religious instruction at the mouth of the Greek priest or Moslem Khatib, vivified by the incorporation in the text of naïve conjectures, points of private humour, and realistic touches from the present day life of the country which shock the pompous listener as absurd anachronisms. Thus . . . our father Adam has been described to us as sitting under the Tree of Knowledge "smoking his narghileh."

They are after all, though more pronouncedly so, like our own children, or like the simple uncultured peasantry of Western Europe. They like to have their facts worked up into concrete presentations rich with detail, and these their own imaginations in the first instance, and then their over-trustful memories, adorn and perpetuate. When thus recognized in their true character these stories have even their historical value which the trained historian can detect. Besides they make delightful stories for reading, and in this latter respect Mr. Hanauer's book may be sure of a welcome from many a young reader, or from those who have to cater for their voracious appetite for stories.

Mr. Pickthall calls our attention to four chronological periods to which these stories belong. Of these the first is that of the Old Testament period, the second that of our Lord and His Apostles, the third that of the "Interval," namely, the time between Christ and Muhammed, often called by the Arabs the

¹ By J. E. Hanauer. With an Introduction by Marmaduke Pickthall. London: Duckworth and Co. Pp. x, 325. Price, 5s. net. 1910.

Time of the Ignorance, and the fourth comprising the whole time downwards from the conquest of Jerusalem by the Caliph Omar ibn el Khattâb. The Arabs, it must be remembered, though they detest St. Paul whom they accuse of having perverted the whole character of the teaching of our Lord, regard the latter with the greatest reverence, though denying His divinity. Thus there are many of these folk-lore tales current both among Moslems and Christians which belong to His time, and we cannot but think it unfortunate that Mr. Hanauer should have omitted them from his book on the plea that "most if not all of them are elsewhere accessible in the Apocryphal Gospels or one or other of the multiplied Lives of the Saints." All the more, it seems to us, one would wish on this account to have them, as terms for comparison, in the exact form in which they are to be found on the living lips of the present inhabitants of the Holy Land. In the arrangement of this folk-lore, the author has not adhered to these chronological divisions, but has preferred to classify the stories into those "concerning the Creation and divers Saints and miracles," those "containing legends and anecdotes partly founded on fact," and those "illustrating social ideas, superstitions," &c.

The book evidently represents a great deal of diligent and careful investigation on the spot, and is very likely, as Mr. Pickthall believes, the largest collection of such stories that has so far been made, although "but a pailful from the sea as compared with the floating mass of folk-lore which exists in Palestine." Mr. Pickthall is also justified in claiming that "with much that is puerile [the stories] contain both wit and humour, and withal not a little of that Heavenly Wisdom, the Wisdom of Solomon, and of the Son of Sirach, to which, in the East, churches were once dedicated." It is due to the publisher to add that this handsome volume of 325 pages is priced so low as 5s. net.

7.—HINTS ON EDUCATION.¹

Practical Hints on Education is the English translation of a German work which has been very favourably received on the Continent. The authoress is also the translator, and she describes herself as one who has had much experience and excep-

¹ *Practical Hints on Education to Parents and Teachers.* A translation from her original German work. By Elise Flury. London: Washbourne and Co. Pp. viii, 206. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1910.

tional opportunities as a governess. The character of her book justifies this claim, for it covers a great deal of ground, and is marked everywhere by observations and counsels which bear the stamp not merely of book knowledge and abstract speculation, but also of a thorough practical experience. The first twelve chapters discuss the qualities required in an educator, the means of education, the moral virtues, the social virtues, work and play, vanity and affectation, and so on, considering in regard to each the methods by which the needful training is to be made effective in children of different characters. Next come five chapters on Psychological Education, a phrase for which we confess to a dislike as savouring too much of the *doctrinaire* systems so dear to Education Offices. Still, it is probably derived from Baumgartner, whose pedagogical work the authoress tells us she has abridged and adapted. It is a useful inset to the volume, but we are inclined to prefer the chapters in which the authoress has given us what is all her own. The four concluding chapters refer to the physical training of children, and are particularly helpful, as they explain some needful points, giving reasons for what is prescribed, and that in language which is not too scientific to be intelligible.

Quotation is the best illustration of the character of a book, and we may choose one which bears on an important but much-neglected subject.

It is a mistake not to allow children to have any money in their hands, because in this way they will never learn the art of handling it rightly. The children of avaricious parents are often the greatest spendthrifts. They have not learnt the proper use of money during the life-time of their parents, because none was ever given to them; and now, as soon as they see themselves in possession of it, they squander it foolishly. Often they fall into utter want. A money-box and a Post Office Savings Bank book are for a child an encouragement in the direction of economy. Great care must be taken lest economy degenerate into avarice. Active charity and content (?) must therefore always be the faithful companions of economy.

And again :

A child should be early taught to exercise active compassion. He must learn that giving makes happier than receiving; that to give alms is not merely an optional good work, but an obligation. Even the poor are not excluded from this duty. They too can give their prayers or their services to others who are poor. . . . Many have the praise-

worthy habit of bestowing their alms through their children. Alms from an innocent child's hands are, in the first place, very pleasing to God, and, secondly, they are for the child a practical lesson in charity.

There is something in this last remark, still there is something which it misses. It is an important but much neglected duty in these days to train children to give of their own. Let them have more money than would otherwise be deemed fitting, that they may learn to employ a suitable portion of it for purposes of charity—for the Church offertories, for the poor, for missions, and other good objects: and teach them too, which is not so difficult, to understand and appreciate those objects, that their alms may not be given in mere adhesion to custom, but spring from loving and kindly hearts.

Two criticisms occur to us. The first is of a minor kind. Tiny boys fall to the governess to train, but as they grow up, and stand in need of the sort of training this book has in view, they require to be trained by men, and by ways that a woman does not altogether understand. It might have been better then if the authoress had confined herself more to her own sex which she does understand, and used throughout "she" and "her," instead of "he" and "his." The other criticism is that the book being by a Catholic, and issued by a Catholic publisher, it would have been well to have more definite and ample reference to the effect of sacraments and suitable devotions in training a child's heart.

In her Preface, Miss Flury speaks of the conviction she has acquired that "many parents are less wanting in the will than in the knowledge of how to do their duty by their children." That is undoubtedly the case, and parents who are in this state could not do better than have by them for continual reference such a handbook as the present. No book is of itself sufficient for the teaching of a young mother, but it can open her eyes, if they need opening, to the general requirements of her office, and the rest, it may be hoped will follow.

8.—ST. JANUARIUS.¹

There is enough of what is good in the volume which Father Edward P. Graham has compiled on the *Mystery of Naples* to make us feel rather impatient of a good deal that is bad.

¹ *The Mystery of Naples.* By Edward P. Graham. St. Louis: Herder. London: Sands and Co. Pp. x, 350. 1910.

Father Graham evidently wishes to be critical and up-to-date. He surrenders, though with something of a sigh, the authenticity of the various "Acts" of St. Januarius. He also admits reluctantly that there is no evidence for the occurrence of any miracle of the liquefaction before the eleventh century or even later. He quotes the modern Bollandists, Father de Smedt and Father Delehay, and professes to adopt the canons which they lay down. And then, after all this, he proceeds to take our breath away by accepting the unsupported statement of a fifteenth century Spanish biography about an obscure twelfth century Scottish Saint, as unreservedly as if it were a contemporary legal document. On the other hand, Father Graham has evidently taken pains over the collection of materials. He quotes an interesting English narrative of 1696, which has been published in one of the volumes of the Camden Society. He summarizes a really useful article by Bishop Lynch, based upon a copy of the official chronicle of the liquefactions preserved in the Treasury. He takes account of certain scientific observations made in 1794—1795 by Professor Fergola, and he has classified very conveniently a number of suggested explanations of the miracle which have been propounded by infidels and other critics. Add to this that the scientific experiments made in modern times by Professors Punzo and Sperindeo and by Father Silva, dealing with the variability in volume and weight of the contents of the phial, and also the spectroscopic tests applied to it, are all carefully recorded, and adequate references as a rule supplied. It will be seen, therefore, that Father Graham's volume, which is not bulky, is in any case an extremely useful work, and we can only regret the more a certain crudity of language and of thought which will stand in the way of its making a deeper impression upon honest inquirers. Lastly, the number of typographical errors is regrettably great. They occur on almost every page, and not only in the Latin quotations, but also in the English descriptions. For example, though the name Taglialatela meets us repeatedly, we find it in p. 64 printed Piglialatela, while eyesores like *marmoream altare, per sanctum Januarius, &c.*, meet us at every turn.

9.—THE HISTORY OF CATHOLICISM IN JAPAN.¹

Father Louis Delplace has completed his very remarkable book on the History of the Catholic Church in Japan by the publication of a second volume, which he entitles "the Era of the Martyrs, 1593—1660." Like its predecessor, this volume is of comparatively small bulk, extending only to 280 pages, but it certainly contains the results of an immense amount of labour, and it may be recommended to all who are interested in the history of the Japanese Mission as the almost indispensable introduction to any profound study of the subject. Every page bears witness to the exact research which the author has spent upon his task. No statement of importance is advanced without an adequate reference, and although the limits which Father Delplace has fixed for himself exclude any elaborate attempt at picturesque or rhetorical description, still the book is very far from being dull to read. The facts are judiciously selected, well marshalled, and clearly presented, and the interest of the grim tragedy carries the reader on almost in spite of himself. The book, indeed, as a record of Christian heroism tried to the utmost limits of human endurance, of glorious promise blighted, of prayers and sacrifices seemingly unheeded, forms perhaps the most harrowing story in the whole history of missionary enterprise. One needs a very strong hold upon the supernatural and a very clear realization of the compensations which God has prepared for His faithful servants in another world to draw spiritual profit from this chronicle of apparent failure. We are glad that the author has not taken farewell of his readers without giving them a hint in his Epilogue of the dawn of a day of brighter promise, and we are glad also to see that Father Delplace is able to form a more hopeful opinion of the fate of the Jesuit Missionaries of 1643, than was put forward in the articles on the subject which appeared in our own pages some few years ago. In conclusion we can only express our appreciation of the admirable qualities which Father Delplace has brought to his task and our hope that the vast store of missionary letters with the contents of which he is so intimately acquainted, may provide the author with material for yet another work on Japan, in which he will perhaps feel more at liberty to linger by the way.

¹ *Le Catholicisme au Japon. II. L'Ere des Martyrs, 1593—1660.* Par L. Delplace, S.J. Bruxelles: Albert Dewit, 53, Rue Royale. Pp. 278. 1910.

10.—CHURCH LIFE IN TERTULLIAN'S DAYS.¹

Dr. Donaldson tells us his aim, or at least one of his aims, in writing the little volume before us, has been to provide those whom Tertullian calls "Simple Folk—not to say ignorant and unlettered—who ever form the majority of Believing Christians," with a picture of the Church Life and Thought of North Africa in that great writer's time. The idea is good, for the time chosen is one so near to the time of the Apostles as to exclude the possibility of any essential innovations on the Apostolic rule having entered in during the interval without its generation being conscious of it. Thus, in the picture of his time painted for us by Tertullian, we may be sure that we see institutions of Apostolic origin.

Tertullian was born at Carthage, and spent most of his life in that city. He must have been born somewhere about 160 A.D., and have been converted to Christianity about 190-5. Directly after his conversion he came forward as a Christian apologist. In this quality he laboured for some ten years or so, but then drifted away into Montanism, with which he formally identified himself about 213 A.D. How long he survived that sad apostasy we do not know for certain. This means that we must distinguish carefully between his Catholic and his Montanist writings, if we wish to use him as a witness to the Catholic life of those days. Still, if we do that, we are enabled to get a wealth of details to illustrate its character, for Tertullian makes constant and vivid references to the manners and customs of his age. Thus in the Church organization he speaks of bishops, priests, and deacons; and accurately defines their functions in regard to Baptism and Holy Communion "The chief priest, who is the Bishop, has the right to give (Baptism); then the priests and deacons, not however without the Bishop's authority . . . otherwise the laity have the right" [to baptize]. In his *De Exhortatione Castitatis* he says: "When there is no gathering of the clergy, you [the laymen] both offer [the Eucharist] and baptize, and are priest to yourself alone." This is a perplexing passage, which the author appears to take as proving that in the days of Tertullian the Catholics actually believed that the laity had all the sacramental powers of the priesthood, though only to be used in cases of emergency. But

¹ *Church Life in North Africa, A.D. 200.* By Stuart A. Donaldson, D.D., Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. Pp. xii, 197. 1909.

the *De Exhortatione Castitatis* was written at the time when he was gradually approximating to Montanism. In his earlier *De Praescriptum Haereticorum*, he sets it down as peculiar to the heretics to observe the distinction between the clerical and the lay estate. "To-day one man is Bishop, to-morrow another; to-day he is deacon who to-morrow is reader; to-day he is presbyter who to-morrow is a layman: for to the laity also they assign priestly functions." The author also tells us that "in the government of the Church the laity had no small share," but this is a statement which he supports by no references, and for which none could be brought.

From Tertullian we can learn that in administering baptism the ceremonies of renouncing the devil, the anointing and laying on of hands, and the triple immersion were already added to the sacramental form. We can learn too from him that the celebration of the Holy Eucharist was the principal act of Christian worship, that it was celebrated in the early morning, that it was regarded as the Body and Blood of Christ, and was offered up in sacrifice, that the Kiss of Peace was given, that the faithful were allowed to take the consecrated Hosts to their homes and communicate themselves every morning. We can learn again how the sign of the Cross was constantly used, and how prayer and even the Holy Eucharist was offered up for the dead. In regard to penance a difficult problem confronts the reader of Tertullian. Did he and his contemporaries know of any private confession, corresponding to that which we now practise, in connection with the public ceremony of *exomologesis*? Dr. Donaldson assumes straight off that there was none, but perhaps the question cannot be solved in so off-hand a manner as that. Père d'Alés, to whom he refers as one of his authorities, has treated it very searchingly, and to him readers may be referred. Still, it is observable that, as Tertullian believed that to post-baptismal sinners only a single further opportunity of forgiveness was offered, those of his contemporaries who shared this rigoristic belief could at best have had to confess privately just this one sin to the Bishop when seeking public penance at his hands.

These are a few of the points of North-African Church life of which we can learn from Tertullian. Other similar points refer to the severity and method of the persecutions which raged during his life-time; also to the rival religions of Isis worship, Mithra worship and Cæsar worship, which were widely

influential in those days, and caused serious difficulty to the Christians. The author has brought together the materials which enable us to judge of the resultant situation, but as his book is intended for "Simple Folk," we cannot help feeling that he would have better served their needs, had he woven these materials into a descriptive narrative.

II.—ENGLISH MEDIÆVAL HOSPITALS.¹

We are glad to give a hearty welcome to Miss R. M. Clay's volume upon the Mediæval Hospitals of England. Without wishing to pass any general censure upon other contributions to the very attractive series of the Antiquary's Books we may confess that they vary very considerably in value and in the help they afford to real students. This volume of Miss Clay's may not from its subject attract a wide circle of readers, neither is it likely to be regarded as in any way final, but it is emphatically a very useful piece of work. It supplies the elements of necessary information upon a much neglected subject, it indicates materials for further study, it takes note of a large number of printed statutes and it provides a tabulated list of such charitable institutions which, while probably far from perfect, is extremely valuable as a basis for further research. On the subject of lepers the author writes very fully and interestingly. It is certain that the mediæval practice of segregation acted very beneficially to check the spread of the disease; neither is there any evidence to show that the lepers were otherwise than well cared for in their enforced seclusion, but rather much testimony to a contrary effect. From the thirteenth to the fifteenth century the number of lepers steadily decreased but Miss Clay is inclined to think that there has been some exaggeration regarding the complete disappearance of the fell disease before the time of Henry VIII. She says, for example,

The south-west corner of England was the last stronghold of leprosy; St. Margaret's, Honiton, had been refounded about 1530. A new leper-hospital was built at Newton Bushell near Exeter in 1538, "for the relief of poor lazar-people whereof great numbers with that disease be now infected in that part to the great danger of infection of much people . . . for the lack of convenient houses in the county of Devonshire for them." Even in 1580, none were admitted to St. Mary

¹ *The Mediæval Hospitals of England.* By *Rotha Mary Clay*. With 78 illustrations, forming part of the series *The Antiquary's Books*. London: Methuen. Pp. xxii, 360. Price, 7s. 6d. net. 1909.

Magdalen's, Exeter, except "sick persons in the disease of leprosy. About the same time it was reported that for a long time there had been a great company of lazar people" at Bodmin.

The information available about general hospitals for the sick, pilgrim houses and almshouses, is, to judge from Miss Clay's pages, much less definite and satisfactory than that which we possess about the lazar-houses. Most of the hospitals undertook charitable relief in a large variety of forms. Thus we learn from a note of William Gregory regarding St. Bartholomew's "Spetylle" in the fifteenth century:

It is a place of great comfort to poor men as for their lodging, and in special unto young women that have mis-done and that been with child. There they be delivered and unto the time of purification they have meat and drink at the place's cost and be full honestly guided and kept.

Miss Clay, it is pleasant to note, has not in any way lost sight of the religious side of mediæval charity. Indeed, we should be tempted to complain that, if anything, too much space has been devoted to the very subsidiary topic of hospital dedications. On the other hand, we should have liked further information upon the effect exercised by the Reformation upon the charitable institutions, which, as the book before us shows, were endowed with so much generosity by our mediæval forefathers. But clearly it would be unreasonable to ask for a complete history of English philanthropy in the narrow limits of a single volume.

Short Notices.

THE fashions of art come and go. They have their brief day, so long only as each new leader lives to insist on himself. But the work of simple men, sincere and without personal affectations, endures and grows in credit with the lapse of time. We have a fine instance of this in the charming volume on the *Sculptures of Chartres Cathedral* (Cambridge University Press, 12s. net.), by Margaret and Ernest Marriage. Till within quite recent years, it was not possible to represent adequately in book form the sculptured figures and delicate stone traceries that are in many places lost to the naked eye in the heights and distances of the vast cathedrals of old. Now, however, by the aid of the telephotographic lens, distant objects are brought within ordinary distance of the eye and made distinct to sight. This instrument has been used with exquisite effect in the preparation of the illustrations of this volume; and in no art work is photography more in place.

Here, in a series of 120 illustrations, we can leisurely gaze upon and enjoy some of the very best stonework of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and find it in all probability more full of character and life, more spirited, and direct, and beautiful, than we had before imagined. Each illustration is explained and its symbolism interpreted in a separate paragraph, first in English and then in French. The critical judgment and fulness of knowledge shown in their elucidations, together with the clearness and conciseness of expression, render the volume perfect in its kind. The authors' hope "that the book may afford a collection of valuable material for lovers of art and students of iconography," cannot but be fulfilled.

The second volume of Father T. J. Campbell's **Pioneer Priests of North America: 1642-1710** (The America Press, \$1.60) is devoted to the missionaries who laboured amongst the Hurons in the present Province of Ontario. It was a strange apostolate, for the natives whose conversion was sought were being all the while pursued to the death by their relentless enemies, the Iroquois. The chief names amongst these heroic men, whose indomitable courage has won the admiration of all historians, are those of Fathers John de Brébeuf¹ and Gabriel Lalemant, whose "cause" as martyrs has been lately introduced in Rome. The cruelty of American Indians is proverbial, and it is seen in its most fiendish development in the terrible martyrdom of these two apostles, and indeed in the sufferings to which all were exposed who laboured for their salvation. Father Campbell describes them as "degraded, ignorant, gross, immoral, obscene in their words and acts, depraved, superstitious, worshippers of the devil, liars, gamblers, traitors, apostates, murderers, fiendishly cruel in torturing their enemies, and not unfrequently cannibals." Yet out of this unpromising material, and under these difficult conditions, the eleven Fathers whose Lives are written here managed during the space of ten years to make thousands of good Christians, and to present to the world types of exalted sanctity. No less than seven of them crowned their labours by a violent death for the Faith. Father Campbell has made an exhaustive study of the "Jesuit Relations" and many other authorities, and his book is well illustrated and furnished with a suitable Index.

We are glad to welcome a second edition of Mother Theodosia Drane's **The Spirit of the Dominican Order, illustrated from the Lives of its Saints** (Washbourne, 3s. 6d.), which was composed as long ago as 1855, and first given to the general public only in 1896. This idea—that the "spirit" of an Order is best seen in the actual lives of those who have attained sanctity through the following of its Rule—is an excellent one, and is excellently well developed. The book makes very edifying, as well as interesting, reading, for the author is always careful to explain the dispositions which underlay the practices, sometimes quaint and sometimes terrible, of God's chosen souls.

Father Paschal Robinson, O.F.M., who has already edited *The Writings of St. Francis* and *The Sayings of Brother Giles* in the same series, has lately issued through the Dolphin Press **The Life of St. Clare**, attributed to Father Thomas of Celano, a contemporary of the Saint, and the first biographer of St. Francis. This translation is practically the only English life of St. Clare in existence, and should be welcomed on that account. There have been several short sketches embodied in other works, and to

¹ A stained-glass window, representing Father de Brébeuf as a saint, is said to adorn the Anglican Church of St. Martin's, Brighton.

the best of our knowledge *The History of the Angelicall Virgin, Glorious Ste. Clare*, translated from the French, with an *Approbatio* dated Douay, 1635, has never been reprinted. As befits the critical editing of an ancient MS., Father Robinson has given a full account of it and its presumed author in an Introduction, and has added a number of explanatory notes to the text. But the reader who wants edification, and not scholarship, will find nothing to distract the attention, for the learning is not obtruded in the text. The book is beautifully printed and got up, and contains a number of good photogravures.

It may be questioned whether the bold speculations of Darwin would have caused so great a stir if the minds of men interested in philosophy had been imbued with the philosophical principles adopted by the Church. For it is well known that the possibility of evolution as an explanation of the variety of creation was contemplated by the Scholastics, following St. Thomas, as he did on this point, St. Augustine. Father Northcote's thoughtful and lucid essay, *The Idea of Development* (Washbourne, 2s.), is devoted to bringing out this truth, which he succeeds in doing with great force, proving by many quotations, chiefly from St. Thomas, that the principles which Darwin laboriously deduced from his stores of observed facts had already been distinctly formulated by Catholic philosophers, although not applied definitely to the explanations of the visible universe. He also calls attention to the fact that several years before Darwin published the results of his researches, Newman, working independently, had applied the principles of evolution to the history of divine revelation. The essay is carefully written, with an eye to those who have not received a formal training in scholastic philosophy, and may be read with profit by those who are anxious to know how far theories of evolution are compatible with the Christian faith. But we think that Father Northcote speaks without sufficient qualification when he says in the opening sentence of his book—"Whosoever departs from scholastic principles undermines reason and imperils faith." A view like this seems to claim for what in many instances springs from merely intellectual speculation something of the certainty of revelation.

The second edition of Mr. Reginald Rye's *The Libraries of London* (University of London, 2s. 6d.) is a great improvement on the first, being much fuller of information and better arranged. It may now be regarded as a very acceptable boon to the student, especially if engaged in research work, for it aims at describing the history, character, and contents of the numerous libraries of London, and making known the facilities they afford to readers. From a very interesting "Preliminary Survey" we learn that the number of volumes in "public and administrative libraries and in the libraries of Societies and Institutions" within the London County boundary is approximately eight and a half millions. The book was originally due to the desire of the Senate of the University of London to direct and economize the energies of its students, but in this second edition it has become a handbook interesting to all engaged in intellectual work of any sort. A word of praise may be given to the many excellent illustrations of libraries contained in the volume. A capital Index enhances its value.

The prayers which Father Joseph Egger, S.J., considers in his little treatise *Are our Prayers Heard?* (Sands: 6d. net), are the petitions which the sense of our varied needs moves us to address to God. There can be no question that prayers of praise and thanksgiving are heard, if they merit

the name of prayer at all. But any feebleness in our faith or hope or love—the triple hold we have on God—may well induce doubts as to whether He hears or rather hearkens to our appeals for grace. It is to remove this possible doubt that Father Egger addresses himself in ten clear chapters of exposition, wherein the Catholic doctrine about the proper conditions and objects of good prayer is thoroughly discussed. Confidence and perseverance alike must increase with the conviction that prayer *never* fails in some good effect.

During this month last year an American writer, Mr. Harold Bolce, began a series of five articles in the *Cosmopolitan*, the purport of which was a general indictment of the non-Catholic Universities in the States for tolerating teaching subversive of Christian, or indeed any, morality. Various replies were attempted by champions of the Universities, but in no case apparently was the charge successfully refuted. This lamentable state of things has moved Father Henry Semple, S.J. to call attention in a booklet which has for title the Ciceronian phrase—**What Times? What Morals? Where on earth are we?** (Benziger: \$0.35)—to the full significance and probable consequences of such teaching. He appeals to the true spirit of American civilization as embodied in the constitution to resist these pernicious doctrines, which affect not only religion but civil society as well. The revelation may well evoke memories of Catiline and will, we trust, bring home to even thoughtless parents the imminent dangers involved in education without God.

The anonymous author of **From Geneva to Rome via Canterbury** (Washbourne, 1s. 6d.), has written a lively little book describing his spiritual experiences in Methodism, of which he gives a very severe account, in various brands of Anglicanism, the weaknesses of which he exposes unsparingly, and in the true Church where he has had the grace to find rest. It is a stimulating record, little resembling the ordinary religious biography, and should have the effect which the author intends of making non-Catholics revise their spiritual attitude. The style is cultured, and an occasional flavour of bitterness is mitigated by humour. One realizes, from the description of the doctrines of Methodism here, how easy a prey a man, who should confound them with Christianity, would fall to the rationalist.

The evangelical practice of poverty is only one means of expressing that entire dependence on God alone, the recognition of which constitutes the creature's perfection by securing to him freedom from every other bond. Unless regarded so, poverty—the not having things—seems a mere negative condition for virtue rather than a virtue in itself. How high and how positive a virtue true poverty is, Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. has shown very well in **St. Francis and Poverty** (Washbourne, 1s. net.). The great Saint's mystical spouse—the “Lady of Poverty”—really meant such an attachment of heart to God that there was room for no other. Hence anything that savoured of private possession, that seemed to imply self-providence, was wholly alien to the Saint's spirit, which rejoiced to see God's practical bounty everywhere, even in the commonest and most universal of His gifts.

How beautifully this spirit is illustrated in the *Fioretti* is known to all lovers of great literature. Such people will welcome yet another and very dainty edition of **The Little Flowers of St. Francis** (Allenson, 2s. 6d. net.), printed in clear type on India paper, which is quite opaque and still so thin that 400 pages occupy less than five-twelfths of an inch in breadth.

The tragic drama in which was accomplished the downfall of the

ancient monarchy of France continues to attract the attention of historians. In **Louis XVI. : étude historique** (Téqui, 3.50 fr.), M. Marius Sepet finishes a series of monographs on the stages of the revolution with a masterly presentment of the career of its principal victim. He is no blind worshipper of royalty or of this particular king, whose faults, partly of character and partly of education, he analyses keenly, but he holds that his execution was a fatal mistake, as Louis XVI. under proper direction would have made an excellent constitutional monarch. The want of an Index is a serious drawback in a work of this nature and interest.

France is the main scene of a stirring historical romance **Love is Life** (Greening and Co., 6s.), in the Stanley Weyman style, by Mrs. L. M. Stacpoole Kenny, the time being the end of the seventeenth century, and many great personages such as Louis le Grand, James II. and Sarsfield entering into the story. Though the tale goes easily enough there is a little inconsistency in the character-drawing. For instance, the author wishes us to think Victor de Saint-Armand the model of a Christian gentleman, yet he is described as proud and haughty, and vain of his personal appearance. There are sentiments also put in the mouths of good Catholics regarding the religious state which are certainly not Catholic in spirit, and a Catholic is reproached on one occasion for considering his "doxy to be the right 'doxy" which of course every Catholic must. These are blemishes in an interesting story, and there are others which the proof-reader should have detected,—various mistakes in French, and, at least twice, *Deo Gratia* as a Latin phrase.

There are no kings or nobles in M. Marc Debrol's **Le Grand Tour** (Calmann-Levy, 3.50 fr.), which is a simple story of a young Frenchman's experiences in America, whither a desire to make his fortune drove him and whence he returned, disillusioned in many ways, but the better fitted to settle down in his own land with his own people. The tale is charmingly told and the various characters, especially those who win the young man's affections, only to disappoint him in the end, are sketched with much skill and shrewdness. Of course, there is one at home who does not disappoint—and is not disappointed.

No author's name is mentioned in **A Life of Christ for Children** (Longmans, 4s. net), but it is recommended by Cardinal Gibbons, so it presumably hails from the States. It tells once more, in appropriately simple language, the ever-fresh story of the earthly career of God Incarnate, dwelling on the lessons conveyed by the divine words and works. An excellent feature of the book, besides the clear type and wide margins, is the series of fifteen reproductions of old masters which illustrate the text.

The editor of the *Revue du Clergé Français* has published under the title of **La Vérité du Catholicisme** (Bloud et Cie., 3.50 fr.) several chapters of popular apologetic in explanation of certain modern problems which agitate the minds of those outside the Church. Amongst these are the difficulty of believing induced by the "scientific spirit," the comparative study of religions, the "higher criticism," &c.; again, the historicity of the Gospels, the Providence of God in the history of the Church, the position and office of St. Peter, the true notion of Development, what Americanism is and is not, and what has been condemned in Modernism. It will be seen how "actual" Père Bricourt's apologetic is: his treatment of the various subjects is thorough and satisfactory.

Much has already been written in France about a young priest of the Oratory of Mary Immaculate who died in 1865. But the example of his career has been thought so valuable that it has been included in a series of lives of eminent Churchmen under the title, **L'Abbé H. Perreyve: Un Modèle de Vie Sacerdotale** (Bédouchaud, 2 fr.), by M. J. Riché. He was a friend and disciple of Lacordaire and Gratry, and, although hampered much by continual ill-health, he made a great impression amongst his contemporaries during the seven short years of his priesthood. His biographer quotes largely from his letters and other writings, and succeeds in presenting a vivid picture of a soul wholly given to God.

Mr. J. R. Morrell's translation of Tauler's **Following of Christ**, first published in 1886, has recently been re-issued by Mr. Fisher Unwin. The question of authorship, like that of a much more famous book, *The Imitation*, has not been definitely settled. But it is certainly the production of one of the German mystics of the fourteenth century, and may be read with profit by those who understand the language of that school, and can distinguish between what is figurative and what is literal. It is in reality an essay on detachment from creatures, developed from our Lord's praises of poverty as a means of perfection. Its fuller title, according to Denifle, is *The Following of the Poor Life of Christ, or the Book of Spiritual Poverty*, which better expresses its scope.

All those engaged in the responsible task of teaching children their Catechism, *i.e.*, instructing them as to what they must believe and how they must behave if they are to save their souls, will find much to help them in Dom Lambert Nolle's **Simple Catechism Lessons** (C.T.S., 2s. 6d.). The book is excellently arranged to prepare young souls, first for the Sacrament of Confession, and secondly for that of Confirmation. Hence the order of questions in the Catechism is somewhat changed, but a list of the lessons in the usual order is given for those who prefer it. The lessons are in the form of explanation, example and application, and the author wisely insists on the necessity of frequent repetition to show that, as our faith is a consistent whole, so should our conduct be.

The important collection of *Textes et Documents pour l'étude historique du Christianisme* edited by MM. Hemmer and Lejay continues to grow steadily. The latest to appear is the third volume of the Apostolic Fathers, **Ignace d'Antioche et Polycarpe de Smyrne** (Picard, 3.00 fr.). The editor and translator of this volume is Auguste Lelong, whose scholarly work merits all the commendation we have bestowed on previous issues. When the series is complete, the student will have at his disposal an edition of early Christian literature which is unsurpassed for cheapness and excellence combined.

The Romance of Olga Aveling (Long, 6s.), by Olivia Ramsay, is just what it describes itself, a pure romance, wherein love runs its chequered course in an atmosphere of mystery, with a plentiful appeal to the goddess of coincidence. Yet despite its essential conventionality, the story is a good one, well-contrived and well-written and interesting throughout. The various characters, some rather melodramatic, are distinctly and consistently drawn, and the *denouement* though tragic is not sad.

Many writers have attempted the theme which Newman made a classic of in *Callista*,—the spread of the Christian faith amidst the paganism of old Rome,—and amongst them Jerome Harte deserves respectful mention. For in **The Light of His Countenance** (Benziger, 4s.), he has constructed

a tale of the persecutions which is both interesting and edifying, showing considerable sense of local colour and grasp of history.

Amongst minor publications we have to notice a pathetic tale of a modern persecution, the story of the **Adana Massacres** of April of last year, well written, printed, and illustrated, and sold for the benefit of the survivors, price 6d., at Ore Place, Hastings. No Roman pagans could have exceeded the brutality of the Turkish mobs during that terrible period, and the effect of their outrages is still seen in the dire poverty of the surviving Christians. The extent of the massacre has never been realized in England, for our papers, so alive to occurrences in the nearer East, took little notice of this outbreak in Asia Minor. The French Fathers at Ore Place will receive and forward subscriptions for the relief of these sufferers for the Faith.

L'Amour de Madeleine (Librairie des Saints-Pères, 0.60 fr.) is the title of a hitherto unknown sermon, discovered in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg by l'Abbé Bonnet and creditably ascribed to Bossuet.

Several useful penny pamphlets of the C.T.S. remain for notice—**The Board of Education and Catholic Secondary Schools** discloses the subtle and pernicious effect on our higher Catholic education, present and future, which the new regulations of the Board are bound to have, unless repealed or modified, and it should be studied by all who have any political influence. **Boys' Clubs**, by Mr. James Britten, gives some admirable instructions, founded on much experience, about the institution and conduct of these excellent social works. **Transubstantiation and the Real Presence**, by the late Father J. F. Splaine, S.J., explains and justifies the Catholic doctrine, so often misunderstood, on this great mystery. **The Intellectual Claims of the Catholic Church**, by Professor Windle, is an endeavour to convince those savants, who neglect and despise Catholic philosophy, of the unreasonableness of their attitude. But the savants will continue to keep their heads buried in the sand: none so blind as those who won't see.

The Martyr's Field is an account of the Ven. Nicholas Postgate, who was martyred at Pickering in 1679, to which is added **The Story of Pickering**, by Mother M. Salome, illustrated from photographs, the whole being sold for sixpence in aid of the building fund for Pickering new Church.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

Allenson, London:

THE LITTLE FLOWERS OF ST. FRANCIS. Pp. 400. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1910. EXISTENCE AFTER DEATH IMPLIED BY SCIENCE: By J. B. Hunt, M.A. Pp. 336. Price, 5s. net. 1910.

The America Press, New York:

PIONEER PRIESTS OF NORTH AMERICA 1642—1710. Vol. II. AMONG THE HURONS: By Rev. T. J. Campbell, S.J. Pp. 480. Price, \$ 1.60. 1910.

Béduchaud, Paris:

L'ABBE H. PERREVE: By J. Riché. Pp. 194. Price, 2.00 fr. 1910.
L'AMOUR DE MADELEINE: Edited by Abbé J. Bonnet. Pp. 38.
Price, 0.60 fr. 1910.

Benziger Brothers, New York:

WHAT TIMES! WHAT MORALS! By H. C. Semple, S.J. Pp. 76.
Price, 1s. 6d. 1910. THE LIGHT OF HIS COUNTENANCE: By
Jerome Harte. Pp. 276. Price, 4s. 1910.

Bloud et Cie., Paris:

L'EVANGILE EN FACE DU SYNCRETISME PAÏEN: By Rev. Bernard
Allo, O.P. Pp. xxi, 206. Price, 3.00 fr. 1910. LA VERITE DU
CATHOLICISME: By Rev. J. Bricourt. Pp. 309. Price, 3.50 fr. 1910.

Burns and Oates, Ltd., London:

SPIRITUAL INSTRUCTION ON RELIGIOUS LIFE: By Fr. H. R. Buckler,
O.P. Pp. 178. Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1910.

Calmann-Levy, Paris:

LE GRAND TOUR: By Marc Debrol. 2e. édit. Pp. 321. Price, 3.50 fr.
1910.

Canterbury and York Society, London:

DIOCESES LONDONIENSIS: REGISTRUM RADULPHI BALDOCK. I.

Catholic Truth Society, London:

SIMPLE CATECHISM LESSONS: By Dom Lambert Nolle, O.S.B.
Pp. 211. Price, 2s. 6d. 1910. SEVERAL PENNY PAMPHLETS.

Caxton Publishing Company, London:

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPÆDIA: VOL. VII. Gregory—Infallibility.
Pp. xv, 800. Price, 27s. 6d. 1910.

The Dolphin Press, Philadelphia:

THE LIFE OF ST. CLARE: Translated and Edited by Fr. Paschal
Robinson, O.F.M. Pp. xliii, 169. Price, \$1.00 net. 1910.

Duckworth and Co., London:

FOLK-LORE OF THE HOLY LAND: By J. E. Hanauer. Pp. xxi, 326.
Price, 5s. 1910.

From the Editor:

THE ADANA MASSACRES AND THE CATHOLIC MISSIONARIES. Pp. 78.
Price, 6d. 1910.

Fisher Unwin, London:

THE FOLLOWING OF CHRIST: By John Tauler. Pp. xxxix, 328.
Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1910.

Greening and Co., London:

LOVE IS LIFE: By L. M. Stacpoole Kenny. Pp. 320. Price, 6s. 1910.

Herder, Friburg:

THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENTS: By the Rev. P. Pourrat, D.D.
Pp. xv, 417. Price, 6s. 1910.

Letouzey et Ané, Paris:

DICTIONNAIRE D'HISTOIRE ET DE GEOGRAPHIE ECCLESIASTIQUES.
Fasc. II.: Achot—Adulis. Price, 5.00 fr. 1910.

Long, London:

THE ROMANCE OF OLGA AVELING: By Olivia Ramsey. Pp. 357.
Price, 6s. 1910.

Longmans, London:

THE SCIENCE OF LIFE AND THE LARGER HOPE: By Right Rev.
J. E. Mercer, D.D. Pp. 195. Price, 3s. 6d. net. 1910. A LIFE
OF CHRIST FOR CHILDREN. Illustrated. Pp. ix, 77. Price, 4s.
net. 1910. THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE: By Leslie J. Walker, S.J.
Pp. xxxix, 696. Price, 9s. 1910.

Picard et Fils, Paris:

LES PERES APOSTOLIQUES: Vol. III. Edited by A. Lelong.
Pp. lxxx, 137. Price, 3.00 fr. 1910.

Rebman, London:

THE ROMANCE OF A MONK: By Alix King. Pp. 299. Price, 6s.
1910.

"Razón y Fe" Press, Madrid:

BOY: By Father Luis Coloma, S.J. Pp. 381. Price, 3.50 pes. 1910.

Kegan Paul, London:

MANUAL OF CHURCH HISTORY: By Dr. F. X. Funk. Vol. I. (from
fifth German edition). Pp. xiii, 396. Price, 12s. net. 1910.

Sands and Co., London:

ST. PETER'S, LANCASTER: By Canon R. N. Billington and John
Brownbill, M.A. Pp. xiv, 293. Price, 12s. 6d. net. 1910. ARE
OUR PRAYERS HEARD? By Joseph Egger, S.J. Pp. 64. Price,
6d. net. 1910.

Tèqui, Paris:

LOUIS XVI.: By Marius Sepet. Pp. 494. Price, 3.50 fr. 1910.

University of London:

GUIDE TO THE LIBRARIES OF LONDON: By R. A. Rye. 2nd edit.
Pp. xii, 206. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1910.

University of Cambridge:

HUNGARY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: By Henri Marczali.
Pp. lxiv, 377. Price, 7s. 6d. net. 1910.

Washbourne, London:

THE SPIRIT OF THE DOMINICAN ORDER: By Mother Francis
Raphael, O.S.D. 2nd edition. Pp. xxvi, 290. Price, 3s. 6d.
1910. THE IDEA OF DEVELOPMENT: By the Rev. P. M. Northcote.
Pp. viii, 127. Price, 2s. 1910. PRACTICAL HINTS ON EDUCA-
TION: By Elise Flury. Pp. viii, 206. Price, 2s. 6d. net. FROM
GENEVA TO ROME VIA CANTERBURY: By Viator. Pp. vii, 85.
Price, 1s. 6d. 1910. ST. FRANCIS AND POVERTY: By Father
Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. Pp. 85. Price, 1s. net.

SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS.

Summary of Contents.

I.

Analecta Bollandiana. (1910).
I.—II.

A. Poncelot.—The Legendarium of Peter Calo.

H. Delehaye.—The Discovery of the Relics of St. Menas at Constantinople.

P. Peeters.—St. Eleutherios Guhistazad.

U. Chevalier.—*Repertorium Hymnologicum* Supplement.

II.

Revue des Questions Historiques. (1910). II.

Hyrvoix de Landosle.—The Kidnapping of the Prior of Vendôme.

C. Bournisien.—The sale of National Property and its Consequences.

L. Froger.—The Chouannerie in 1795.

P. Montarlot.—Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland.

Col. Picard.—The Siege of Dantzic 100 years ago.

III.

Revue Bénédictine. (1910). II.

G. Morin.—Arnobius the Younger and the *Libellus ad Gregorium*.

J. Chapman.—The Contested Letters of Pope Liberius.

G. Morin.—The *Conflictus* of Ambrose Autpert and Bavaria.

U. Berlière.—Henry of Vienne, a Canonist of the Fourteenth Century.

IV.

Stimmen aus Maria Laach. (1910). III.

O. Zimmermann.—The interior Spirit.

B. Duhr.—The History of our Lady's Sodalties in Germany.

V. Cathrein.—Ethical Subjectivity upon a Darwinian Basis.

H. Gruber.—The Battle over Elementary Education in France.

J. G. Hagen.—The Fable of the Comet Bull.

V.

Le Scuola Cattolica. March (1910).

C. Ceresani.—The Dangers of Youth at the present Crisis.

F. S.—Notes on Biblical Criticism.

S. Mondino.—The Moral System of St. Alphonsus Liguori.

L. Manzini.—St. Charles and the Venerable Bascapè.

C. Carcano.—The New Decree upon the visit *ad limina*.

VI.

Razón y Fe. April (1910).

L. Murillo.—The Historic Method in the interpretation of the Synoptics.

R. Ruiz Amado.—The Church and the School.

E. Ugarte de Urcilla.—The Experimental Psychology of the Human Heart.

Z. Garcia.—The Pardon of Sins in the Primitive Church.

M. Martinez.—The Return of Halley's Comet.

VII.

Archivum Franciscanum Historicum. (1910). II.

T. Witzel.—Roger Bacon and the Bible.

G. Golubovich.—A page of Dante—the Count Guido de Montefeltro.

L. Ventura.—J. B. Vico and his Relations with the Franciscans.

L. Olier.—Documents regarding the Fraticelli.

B. Krutwagen.—The Statutes of the Province of Saxony.

